ERIC Document Resume	See Instruction Sheet	DATE OF RESUME 6/24/65	DATE RECEIVED

A. PUBLICATION DATA

ERIC NUMBER ED000153	2. ORIGINATOR CONTROL NO(S). 7491	3. IDENTIFICATION NO. N.A.	DO NOT WRITE IN SPACE BELOW

4. AUTHOR(S): Jamrich, John X.

5. TITLE OF DOCUMENT ABSTRACTED: Financial Assistance to Students in Michigan Institutions of Higher Education, Staff Study No. 8, The Survey of Higher Edu. in Michigan

6. PUBLICATION TITLE: N.A.

7. EDITOR(S): N.A.

8. PLACE OF ORIGIN

ORG. MLSCHE
ST. PO Box 240
CITY, STATE Lansing, Michigan
TELE. EXT.
INST/LOC CODE

9. PUBLISHER OR SOURCE: Michigan Legislative Study Committee on Higher Education

10. VOL.	11. PAGES	12. MO./YR	13. TOTAL PP.
N.A.	N.A.	58	116

MICROFILM COPY AVAILABLE
YES ☒ NO ☐

COPYRIGHT GRANTED
YES ☐ NO ☒

COPYRIGHT RELEASE FILED
YES ☐ NO ☐

TYPE OF REPORT
PROPOSAL ☐
IN-PROGRESS ☐
FINAL ☒
FOLLOW-UP ☐

OTHER ERIC REFERENCES:

ERIC SATELLITE CODE

B. INDEXING DATA

14. SUBJECT AREA

15. TYPE OF ENDEAVOR: survey

16. INDEXING TERMS (6-12)

surveys	finances			
students				
financial aid				

17. ABSTRACT (MAX. 250 WORDS)

A statistical and interpretative study of scholarships, student loans, and student employment. Includes findings and recommendations.

ERIC No.

18. SOURCE OF ABSTRACT

C. FUNDING DATA

19. SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION

20. DIVISION OR DEPT.

21. CONTRACT NO.

PROJECT NO.

22. TOTAL COST OF PROJECT

23. DURATION OR PROJECT

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Office of Education

ERIC Form 1

5-21R

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

√ #7491

ED000153

REPRINT COPY

HE7491

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO STUDENTS IN MICHIGAN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Staff Study No. 8

THE SURVEY OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN MICHIGAN

LANSING, MICHIGAN *May 1958*

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO STUDENTS IN MICHIGAN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Staff Study No. 8

THE SURVEY OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN MICHIGAN

LANSING, MICHIGAN *May 1958*

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO STUDENTS IN MICHIGAN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

by

John X. Jamrich

Assistant Director of the Survey

Staff Study No. 8

The Survey of Higher Education in Michigan

John Dale Russell

Director of the Survey

Prepared for the Michigan Legislative Study Committee on Higher Education
P.O. Box 240, State Capitol, Lansing

May 1958

MEMBERS OF THE MICHIGAN LEGISLATIVE STUDY COMMITTEE ON HIGHER EDUCATION

Senators:

Frank Andrews

Frank D. Beadle

Patrick J. Doyle

Clyde H. Geerlings, Vice Chairman

Edward Hutchinson

Representatives:

Charles A. Boyer, Chairman

Arnell Engstrom

Allison Green

John J. Penczak

Frank D. Williams

MEMBERS OF THE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

George W. Dean, President, Michigan Federation of Labor, Lansing

S. D. Den Uyl, President, Bohn Aluminum and Brass Corporation, Detroit

Merritt D. Hill, General Manager, Tractor and Implement Division, Ford Motor Company, Birmingham

Benjamin Levinson, President, Michigan Mortgage Corporation, Detroit

W. D. Merrifield, Director of Industrial Education, Chrysler Corporation, Detroit

Stephen S. Nisbet, Vice President -- Public Relations, Gerber Products Company, Fremont

Stanley M. Powell, Legislative Counsel, Michigan Farm Bureau, Ionia

Don Stevens, Education Director, Michigan C.I.O. Council, Grand Rapids

Robert L. Taylor, Secretary-Treasurer, State Mutual Cyclone Insurance Company, Lapeer

Don Vander Werp, former State Senator, Fremont

James M. VerMeulen, Vice President, American Seating Company, Grand Rapids

Publications Issued (to April, 1958) in

THE SURVEY OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN MICHIGAN

Preliminary Report to the Michigan Legislative Study Committee on Higher Education, by John Dale Russell, March, 1957

Staff Study No. 1, The Community College in Michigan, by S. V. Martorana, June, 1957

Staff Study No. 2, Geographic Origins of Michigan College Students, by John Dale Russell and Orvin T. Richardson, August, 1957

Staff Study No. 3, Education in Medicine and Nursing in Michigan, by Dr. W. T. Sanger, December, 1957

Staff Study No. 4, Physical Plant Needs in the State-controlled Institutions of Higher Education in Michigan, by Earl W. Anderson and Elden B. Sessions, January, 1958

Staff Study No. 5, Student Personnel Services in the Publicly Controlled Colleges and Universities in Michigan, by Orvin T. Richardson, February, 1958.

Staff Study No. 6, Instructional Programs in Michigan Institutions of Higher Education, by John Dale Russell, John X. Jamrich, and Orvin T. Richardson, March, 1958

Staff Study No. 7, Extension and Field Services in the State-controlled Colleges and Universities in Michigan, by Julius M. Nolte and Robert Bell Browne, April, 1958

Copies of these publications may be obtained, subject to the availability of the supply, on request from the office of the Michigan Legislative Study Committee on Higher Education, P. O. Box 240 (Fourth Floor, State Capitol), Lansing, Michigan.

FOREWORD

The provision of financial assistance to students is recognized almost universally as an important obligation of institutions of higher education. In general, the administration of such awards is considered a part of a modern program of student personnel services. Staff Study No. 5, in the series being published for the Survey of Higher Education in Michigan, dealt with all phases of student personnel services in the publicly controlled institutions except the programs of financial assistance. The purpose of the present Staff Study is to report the data on the three major kinds of financial assistance to students in the Michigan institutions.

The data of the study are based on conditions in the academic year 1956-57. The basic information was collected on schedules filled out by the individual institutions. The request for data was sent to each of the 64 institutions recognized as providing service in higher education in Michigan. The response was excellent, and the returns on which the present report is based were from institutions representing all but a very small fraction of the students attending college in Michigan in 1956-57. The requested data were not readily available in many of the institutions, and some of them could not supply any information at all on certain points. In almost all the institutions the preparation of the statistics involved considerable work on the part of administrative officials. The Survey acknowledges with thanks the excellent cooperation received from the Michigan institutions in providing data for this study.

The preparation of Staff Study No. 8 has been carried out under the general direction of Dr. John X. Jamrich, Assistant Director of the Survey. Dr. Jamrich has served as Assistant Director of the Survey since September 1, 1957, while on leave of absence from his regular position as Dean of the College and Professor of Mathematics at Doane College, Crete, Nebraska. Dr. Jamrich is well qualified by experience to prepare the report of this study, having been in charge of the student-aid program at his own institution, Doane College, and having served, prior to taking his present position at Doane College, as Dean of Students at Coe College, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, where he was also in charge of the program of financial assistance to students.

The reader should understand that the text, the findings, and the recommendations of this Staff Study are the work of Dr. Jamrich. He alone is responsible for the report that appears as Staff Study No. 8. As in the case of previously published Staff Studies in the Survey series, the report is being presented to the Michigan Legislative Study Committee on Higher Education, and to the Citizens Advisory Committee, for their information, but this does not imply endorsement of the findings and recommendations by either of the Committees. The Legislative Study Committee on Higher Education, having received the report, will reach its own conclusions concerning the recommendations to be presented to the Legislature for action.

The publication of this report is in accordance with the general terms of the arrangements for the Survey, which provide that the Director shall have full authority to decide what shall be published as Staff Studies and as his report to the Legislative Study Committee on Higher Education. The subject of financial assistance to students has been of considerable interest recently in Michigan, and legislation to provide scholarships has been proposed and considered in the 1958 session of the Legislature. The text of the report by Dr. Jamrich is being published in the belief that, in addition to being a necessary part of a comprehensive survey, it will provide significant information for the guidance of the officials of institutions, the members of the Legislature, and the friends of higher education all over the State who have supported by their gifts and contributions the institutional programs of financial assistance to students, and who should be encouraged in every way to continue and to expand such support.

John Dale Russell
Director of the Survey

May, 1958

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Foreword (by the Director of the Survey). iv

List of Tables. ix

CHAPTER

I. PURPOSE AND METHOD OF THE STUDY 1

II. SCHOLARSHIPS. 10

Amounts and Sources of Funds Available 10

Scholarship Awards Made during 1956-57 21

Awards to Students at Different Academic Levels 21

Awards in the Different Kinds of Institutions 24

Awards in Individual State-controlled Institutions. . . 27

Awards in Individual Community Colleges 31

Awards in Individual Privately Controlled Institutions. 31

Size of Scholarship Grants 39

Restrictions on Scholarship Grants 49

Restrictions on Financial Need and Academic Achievement 49

Restrictions Related to Sex of Recipient. 55

Restrictions Related to the Residence of Recipient. . . 55

Time Limitations and Repayment Obligations. 57

Unused Scholarships 63

Restrictions Related to Academic Objective of Recipient 63

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

CHAPTER Page

III. STUDENT LOANS 67

Capital of Student Loan Funds during 1956-57 68

Loans Made and Collected during 1956-57. 71

Terms of Student Loans 81

IV. STUDENT EMPLOYMENT BY THE INSTITUTIONS. 83

V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS 94

Appendix A -- Form Used in Collecting Data 108

Appendix B -- State Board of Education Scholarships 115

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE Page

1. Amount and Source of Funds Available for Scholarships in the Regular 1956-57 Academic Year in the Three Types of Institutions of Higher Education in Michigan 12

2. Amount and Source of Funds Available for Scholarships during 1956-57 in the State-controlled Institutions of Michigan. 16

3. Amount and Source of Funds Available for Scholarships during 1956-57 in the Privately Controlled Institutions of Michigan. . . 17

4. Amount and Source of Funds Available for Scholarships during 1956-57 in the Community Colleges of Michigan 19

5. Total Number and Amount of Scholarships Awarded during 1956-57 in the Three Types of Institutions in Michigan, According to the Academic Level of the Recipient 22

6. Total Number and Amount of Scholarships Awarded during 1956-57 in the State-controlled Institutions in Michigan. 28

7. Total Number and Amount of Scholarships Awarded during 1956-57 in the Community Colleges in Michigan 32

8. Total Number and Amount of Scholarships Awarded during 1956-57 in the Privately Controlled Institutions in Michigan. 35

9. Number and Percentage of Students Receiving Scholarship Grants of Each Size, 1956-57 40

10. Number of Students Receiving Scholarship Grants of Each Size -- State-controlled Institutions -- 1956-57. 43

11. Number of Students Receiving Scholarship Grants of Each Size -- Privately Controlled Institutions -- 1956-57. 44

12. Number of Students Receiving Scholarship Grants of Each Size -- Community Colleges -- 1956-57 45

13. Number of Scholarship Grants Awarded, Classified According to the Size of the Award in Relation to the Institutional Tuition Charge, in the Three Types of Michigan Institutions, 1956-57. . . 47

14. Number, Amount, and Percentage of Awards Made in the Three Types of Institutions on the Basis of Prior Academic Achievement and Financial Need of the Recipient 50

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

TABLE Page

15. Number and Amount of Awards Made in State-controlled Institutions during 1956-57 on the Basis of Prior Academic Achievement and Financial Need of the Recipient 51

16. Number and Amount of Awards Made in Privately Controlled Institutions during 1956-57 on the Basis of Prior Academic Achievement and Financial Need of the Recipient 52

17. Number and Amount of Awards Made in Community Colleges during 1956-57 on the Basis of Prior Academic Achievement and Financial Need of the Recipient 53

18. Number, Amount, and Percentage of Awards Made in the Three Types of Institutions during 1956-57 on the Basis of the Sex of the Recipient 55

19. Number, Amount, and Percentage of Scholarships Awarded Having Restrictions Related to the Residence of the Recipient in the Three Types of Institutions 56

20. Number and Amount of Scholarships Awarded Having Restrictions Related to the Residence of the Recipient, State-controlled Institutions. 58

21. Number and Amount of Scholarships Awarded Having Restrictions Related to the Residence of the Recipient, Privately Controlled Institutions. 59

22. Number and Amount of Scholarships Awarded Having Restrictions Related to the Residence of the Recipient, Community Colleges . . 61

23. Number and Amount of Scholarships Awarded Having Time Limitation on Holding of the Awards. 62

24. Number and Amount of Scholarships Awarded Having Restrictions Related to the Academic Field of the Recipient's Preparation. . . 64

25. Number and Amount of Scholarships Awarded Having Restrictions Related to Special Abilities of the Recipient 66

26. Capital of Student Loan Funds during 1956-57 for the Three Types of Institutions in Michigan 69

27. Student Loan Fund Capital during 1956-57 in the State-controlled Institutions. 72

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

TABLE Page

28. Student Loan Fund Capital during 1956-57 in the Privately Controlled Institutions 73

29. Student Loan Fund Capital during 1956-57 in the Community Colleges. 74

30. Loan Fund Transactions during 1956-57 in the Three Types of Institutions in Michigan. 75

31. Condition of Loan Funds in the Three Types of Institutions in Michigan at End of Fiscal Year, 1956-57 75

32. Condition of Loan Funds during 1956-57 in the State-controlled Institutions in Michigan. 78

33. Condition of Loan Funds during 1956-57 in the Privately Controlled Institutions in Michigan. 79

34. Condition of Loan Funds during 1956-57 in the Community Colleges in Michigan. 80

35. Length of Term of Student Loans in the Three Types of Institutions in Michigan 82

36. Number of Students Employed and Compensation Paid Them in the Three Types of Michigan Institutions during 1956-57 86

37. Number of Students Employed and the Amounts of Compensation Paid Them in the State-controlled Institutions during 1956-57. 89

38. Number of Students Employed and the Amounts of Compensation Paid Them in the Privately Controlled Institutions during 1956-57. . . 90

39. Number of Students Employed and the Amounts of Compensation Paid Them in the Community Colleges during 1956-57 91

40. Totals of Financial Assistance to Students in Various Forms at Each of the Three Kinds of Institutions in Michigan during 1956-57 97

CHAPTER I

PURPOSE AND METHOD OF THE STUDY

Financial assistance to students has been a part of the pattern of higher education for many centuries. Colleges and universities have long recognized that the cost of attendance is beyond the means of large numbers of capable young people. Some sort of financial aid is necessary in order to encourage attendance by many of those whose education would be of great benefit to them and to the world in which they live. In modern times programs of financial assistance to students take three forms.

The most widely known form of student aid is perhaps the scholarship. This is simply a grant to the student of an amount of funds to be used toward the expenses of college attendance. In many cases the grant is made in such a way that the student is relieved from the payment of a part or all of the tuition fee. Normally the resources used for scholarship purposes are supplied by special gifts or by income from endowment designated for that use by the donor. Some institutions use their current unrestricted funds to finance scholarships for their students. A special variety of scholarship is the fellowship, which is ordinarily restricted to graduate students, is usually in a larger amount than the scholarship, and often involves some recognition as a member of the faculty. In general the practice of institutions is to award scholarships in recognition of the high ability and great promise of the recipient. A scholarship or fellowship is considered an honor as well as a form of financial assistance.

The second form of financial assistance to students is the loan fund. A loan is a useful form of aid for students who will be able to repay later from their earnings or other resources. Students can be assisted by means of loans if they have reasonably satisfactory academic records, even though their achievement is not at the high level that would warrant the grant of a scholarship or fellowship. Capital for student loan funds has been obtained by most institutions of higher education from gifts by alumni and other friends. Many non-institutional sources of funds for loans to students are also available for those attending colleges and universities in the United States.

The third form of financial assistance to students is remunerative employment. Students of average or better than average ability, who are willing to work at a job for some hours each week outside the time needed for their academic programs, can usually find opportunity for employment that will bring in earnings to assist in financing their expenses of attending college. It is customary in most colleges and universities to employ students for some of the work involved in operating the institution. Most institutions also have some more or less formal arrangements to assist students to find employment opportunities in the community outside the institution itself. To an increasing extent people who are employed full time in a community where a college or university is located take advantage of the opportunity to attend college on a part-time basis.

The primary purpose of all the various forms of financial assistance to students is to lower or eliminate the financial barriers to college attendance. Some forms of aid, particularly the scholarship and fellowship, may in some instances be awarded as an honor or as a motivating device for students of exceptional promise, without regard to their financial need. Employment, likewise, may in itself be useful to the student as a means of broadening his educational experience in addition to providing a source of income for meeting the expenses of college attendance.

To attend college in the United States today generally requires a substantial outlay of cash by the student. A recent study by the U. S. Office of Education[1] showed that in 1952-53 the average student attending a privately controlled college spent $1,674 for current purposes annually; the average for those attending publicly controlled institutions was $1,120. The study estimated that, because of increases in tuition fees and other costs, the total current and capital costs of the average student in 1957 was $2,047 for attendance at a privately controlled college and $1,493 for attendance at a publicly controlled institution. Cash expenditure may be held to a minimum by students who are able to live at home while attending college, especially if they attend a publicly controlled institution, and if they are willing to do without many of the conveniences and forego many of the activities that most students regard as a part of a reasonable standard of living on the campus.

Extensive studies in other States have shown that a large proportion of the most capable high-school graduates do not enter college. No matter how the upper level of talent is defined among high-school graduates, whether as the upper 10 per cent, the upper quarter, or the upper third, the studies uniformly show that about half of the most capable young people do not continue their education after graduating from high school. The studies further show that lack of money is the chief reason for this situation, though lack of motivation is also an important cause for the failure of many capable high-school graduates to enter college. The availability of financial aid and the honor attached to a scholarship grant sometimes serve as motivating devices for capable young people who would not otherwise be stimulated to attend college after graduating from high school.

---

[1] Ernest V. Hollis and Associates, Costs of Attending College, pp. 25-29. Bulletin 1957, No. 9, U. S. Office of Education.

In a time when the country needs the best service of all its highly talented citizens, the waste of human resources involved in the failure to educate large numbers of the most capable young people to the limits of their ability seems intolerable. The solution most widely proposed is a large increase in the program of financial assistance to students, so that financial barriers may not hinder well qualified young people from continuing their education. A democratic society cannot afford to allow access to higher education to be limited mainly to young people from the higher economic brackets.

Furthermore, institutions seem to be increasingly aware that their prestige and reputation depend to a considerable extent on the scholarly productivity of their students and graduates. The satisfaction a faculty member finds in his work is greatly enhanced by the presence of highly capable students in his classes. These factors have resulted in competition among institutions for the most able students. Each institution is led by these considerations to seek out the most promising young people and to encourage them, through the offer of a scholarship, to become a matriculant. The search for the capable student and scholar as the nucleus of intellectual ferment in colleges and universities is matched and sometimes surpassed by a similar search on the part of many institutions of higher education for young people with outstanding ability in music, debate, athletics, and the like. To college-bound students with these sorts of abilities, under varying requirements and qualifications, financial assistance is also extended.

One form of financial assistance to students is often overlooked. In almost every institution the students receive a subsidy that enables them to obtain their education at less than the cost of its production. A few instances may be found in which the tuition fees charged the student are fully equal to the annual expenditure per student for educational purposes in the institution, but in the great majority of institutions operated on a non-profit-making basis some supplementary resources, beyond tuition fees, are used to finance the current costs of the educational program. In the privately controlled institutions the supplementary resources are derived from endowment earnings, church contributions, and gifts from private donors and many kinds of organizations interested in higher education. The publicly controlled institutions have some income from many of these same sources, but also have appropriations of tax funds to support their educational programs.

Institutions of higher education, like most other organizations today, face a steadily increasing cost of operation. Faculty salaries especially need to be improved greatly, and the cost of the commodities and services that colleges must purchase and use in their operations seems to be steadily increasing. Available income from non-student sources has not kept pace with the rise in prices and the expansions in enrollments and services of the institutions. To maintain programs of good quality and scope, colleges and universities have in recent years made marked increases in their charges to students. To avoid the undesirable consequence of thus denying educational opportunities to those with limited resources, increases in programs of financial assistance to students seem imperative.

Another possible solution to the problem of encouraging college attendance by capable young people is the policy of charging the lowest possible tuition fees. This is particularly applicable to the publicly controlled institutions. Most privately controlled institutions also try to keep their fees as low as possible and make significant efforts to obtain supporting funds from sources other than students. A widely distributed system of tuition-free community colleges, such as is found in California, is perhaps the best approach to a democratic provision of opportunity for higher education, at least through the first two college years. While the provision of tuition-free education in publicly controlled institutions would doubtless be the most statesman-like solution of the problem, it has not been possible in most States to follow such a policy, even in the community colleges, and in no State are the degree-granting institutions completely tuition-free. As a result, institutions have intensified their efforts to obtain funds to be used as sources of financial assistance to students.

The whole problem of financial assistance to students is of great public interest. Proposals currently before the Congress of the United States look toward the provision of relatively large Federal funds for scholarships for college students. Bills have been introduced for a similar purpose in the 1958 session of the Michigan Legislature. In addition to the interest shown by members of Congress and the State Legislature, the subject of financial aid is of concern to students and their parents, to the officials of the educational institutions, and to the public spirited citizens who may be expected to contribute funds for scholarship and loan purposes in colleges and universities.

The purpose of the present study is to gather and present information concerning the provisions of financial assistance to students in the colleges and universities of Michigan during the 1956-57 academic year. It is hoped that the analyses and summaries of these data will provide an objective basis for judging the adequacy of financial assistance programs in the Michigan institutions of higher education, and furnish a point of reference for considering new proposals for the establishment of scholarship programs.

This study is concerned with the three major types of financial assistance to students which were identified above, namely, scholarships, loans, and employment.[2] The first category, variously known as scholarships, fellowships, grants-in-aid, and tuition discounts, includes those grants or awards for which no service of any sort is required of the student by the institution and no repayment is normally expected. In general, the selection of a student as a recipient of a scholarship award is looked upon as an honor, because in the majority of instances, academic potential is a qualification for selection. The study includes only those scholarship grants that are directly under the control of the institutions. Scholarships provided by outside organizations that also select the recipients are not included in this study.

The second category of financial assistance is the student loan fund. The nature of this assistance is implied in the name, that is, the financial aid is in the form of a loan made to the student from funds designated specifically for this purpose. The majority of loan funds are either of the endowed type or the revolving type of fund. The endowed type of loan fund is one in which loans are made only from the earnings of an endowment designated for this purpose. In the revolving type of loan fund, the entire capital of the fund is available for loans to students. For a given amount of capital, the revolving loan fund will finance a larger program of assistance to students than the endowed loan fund. Only loan funds that are directly under the control of the institutions are included in the present study, and no attempt has been made to gather information about the availability and use of funds for student loans from non-institutional agencies.

---

[2] For a much more extensive discussion of financial assistance to students in institutions of higher education, the reader is referred to Financing of Higher Education, by John Dale Russell (University of Chicago Press, Revised Edition, 1954).

The third category of financial assistance to students is remunerative employment. For this study, consideration is given only to such employment as is provided by the institution. Thus, omitted from the discussion will be the substantial volume of employment readily available to students in nearby business and industry at most of the institutions.

It is evident that the distinctions among these three categories are not perfectly clear at all times. For example, some institutions have awards classified as "scholarships" which, though given with the general understanding that no service is required, do have a clause in their description stipulating that from time to time certain services may be required of the recipients. In many kinds of jobs at which students are employed, the main consideration is to get the work done, but in other cases, such as appointment as a departmental assistant or paper reader for a professor, the position is filled on the basis of the student's academic accomplishment and may carry as much prestige as a scholarship or fellowship.

The information schedule, used in compiling the data for this study, (Appendix A) was mailed in October, 1957, to the 64 institutions in Michigan listed in The Preliminary Report of the Michigan Legislative Study Committee on Higher Education. Data were requested for the year 1956-57. Replies were received from all ten State-controlled institutions, from all the fourteen community colleges that were operating in 1956-57, and from thirty-one of the privately controlled colleges and universities. Of the privately controlled institutions not providing information for the study, three were liberal arts colleges; the remainder were small, specialized institutions. These fifty-five colleges and universities represent 86 per cent of the possible number of replies, and represent 97 per cent of the student enrollments for the academic year 1956-57 in all institutions of higher education in Michigan.

CHAPTER II

SCHOLARSHIPS

The discussion of the present chapter is concerned with the first major type of financial assistance available to students, namely, funds used for scholarships, fellowships, and similar awards. Grants and awards included in this discussion are those for which no service is required of the student and repayment is normally not expected. In this chapter, consideration is given to the amounts available for scholarship awards from various sources, the amounts actually granted in 1956-57 as scholarships to students at different academic levels, the size of the individual grants, and the nature of the stated restrictions and qualifications placed on the award of scholarships.

Amounts and Sources of Funds Available

The amounts of scholarship funds available in Michigan were analyzed for individual institutions, for each of the three types of institutions, and according to the sources from which these funds were derived. The source of funds was considered in two broad categories, namely, general institutional funds which are not specifically designated for scholarships, and those funds which are restricted for scholarship purposes. In the latter division were included income from endowment, private gifts and grants, the State-funded scholarships which are available in certain State-controlled institutions through budgetary arrangements with the Legislature,[1] and other, miscellaneous sources.

---

[1] See Appendix B for a description of the State Board of Education Scholarships.

Table 1 shows the amounts of scholarship funds available in the regular academic year 1956-57, the sources of these funds, and the value per full-time-equivalent student[2] in totals for each of the three groups of institutions. A total of $3,196,497 was available for scholarships in the institutions of higher education in Michigan in 1956-57. Of this total, $2,690,377 or 84.2 per cent was in the State-controlled institutions. The privately controlled institutions had 14.4 per cent of the funds available for scholarships, and the community colleges only 1.4 per cent.

A view of the relative adequacy of scholarship funds in each of the three groups of institutions can be obtained from the data shown in Table 1 on amounts per full-time-equivalent student. In the entire State the scholarship funds available amounted to $30.93 per full-time-equivalent student enrolled in 1956-57. In the State-controlled institutions the amount of scholarship aid available per full-time-equivalent student is slightly more than twice as large as the amount per full-time-equivalent student in the privately controlled institutions. The relatively low amount available per student in the privately controlled institutions of Michigan would not be increased greatly even if the institutions which have no scholarship funds whatever were excluded from the calculation. At best the amount would not rise to more than $25.00 per student if institutions without

---

[2] Data on full-time-equivalent enrollments at the reporting institutions for 1956-57 were obtained from the Department of Public Instruction, and are based upon that Department's stated basis of reporting full-time-equivalent enrollments (Definition of Terms of the Annual Institutional Report to the State Board of Education, Fall, 1957):

> "Full-time-equivalent -- The undergraduate, unclassified, or special enrollment should be computed on the basis of one for each full-time student as generally defined by each institution and the total credit hours of those determined as part-time students divided by 14. The graduate-professionals and graduate full-time-equivalents should be computed on the basis of one for each full-time student as generally defined by each institution and the total credit hours of those determined as part-time divided by 8. No student can be counted as more than one full-time student regardless of the credit hours for which he is enrolled."

Table 1. Amount and Source of Funds Available for Scholarships during 1956-57 in the Three Types of Institutions of Higher Education in Michigan.

Type of Institution		General Institutional Funds	Endowments	Private Gifts	State Government	Totals
State-controlled	Amount available	$1,009,582	$317,330	$1,110,388	$253,077	$2,690,377
Full-time-equivalent enrollment = 68,910	Amount available per F.T.E. student	14.65	4.61	16.11	3.67	39.04
Privately controlled	Amount available	175,774	75,762	210,292	-	461,828
Full-time-equivalent enrollment = 23,579	Amount available per F.T.E. student	7.45	3.21	8.92	-	19.47
Community college	Amount available	14,305	1,009	28,978	-	44,292
Full-time-equivalent enrollment = 10,868	Amount available per F.T.E. student	1.32	0.09	2.67	-	4.08
Totals	Amount available	$1,199,661	$394,101	$1,349,658	$253,077	$3,196,497
Full-time-equivalent enrollment = 103,357	Amount available per F.T.E. student	11.61	3.81	13.06	2.45	30.93

any scholarship funds were excluded from the calculation of the average for privately controlled institutions. In the group of community colleges the amount per full-time-equivalent student is very small, only a little more than one-tenth as great as the amount per full-time-equivalent student in the State-controlled institutions.

It is interesting to note from Table 1 that in the State-controlled institutions in Michigan the amount per full-time-equivalent student is larger from every source of funds than the amounts per student from the corresponding sources of funds in the privately controlled institutions. Scholarship funds available from private gifts are almost twice as large, per full-time-equivalent student, in the State-controlled institutions as in the privately controlled colleges. The State-controlled institutions also derive a larger income from endowment for scholarship purposes, per full-time-equivalent student, than the privately controlled institutions do from this source.

The amount available for scholarships from direct allowances by the State government is relatively small, per full-time-equivalent student, in the State-controlled institutions of Michigan. It must be recognized, however, that grants from general institutional funds, in the case of the State-controlled institutions, doubtless involve support to a considerable extent by State appropriations. Though it is not possible to trace the funds used in this category to the ultimate source from which they are derived, it may be estimated that from two-thirds to three-fourths of the general institutional funds are derived from State appropriations.

Some idea of the relative adequacy of scholarship funds may also be obtained by comparing the amount per full-time-equivalent student with the average payment by students for tuition and other general fees. Exact figures are not available for the total fee charges to students in the Michigan institutions in 1956-57, but a rough calculation of the total of such charges leads to the conclusion that the available scholarship aid is approximately 13 per cent of what the students pay as tuition and other general fees. In the State-controlled institutions as a group the total scholarship aid available is approximately 20 per cent of the total fee charges; in other words the scholarship funds available would permit the State-controlled institutions to allow one student out of each five to attend without paying any of the fees regularly charged all students. In the privately controlled institutions the available scholarship aid is approximately 5 per cent of what the students pay as tuition and fees, and in the community colleges it is approximately 3 per cent.

Another idea of the relative adequacy of the total scholarship funds in the institutions of higher education in Michigan may be obtained from data published in a Bulletin of the U. S. Office of Education[3] showing the number and amount of scholarships for undergraduates in 1955-56 in each institution throughout the country, with summaries for each of the States. The tabulations in that report show that, in the year just prior to the one for which data were gathered in the present study, Michigan ranked seventh from the top among the States in the total amount of funds for scholarships for undergraduate students. The States exceeding Michigan were Pennsylvania, New York, Massachusetts, Illinois, Ohio, and California. Michigan also ranked seventh among the States in total college student enrollment in the fall of 1955. In number of scholarships awarded in 1955-56, Michigan ranked fourth among the States.[4] From these data one would conclude that Michigan is on a par with other States in the amount of funds for scholarships for undergraduate students, in proportion to the number of students enrolled, and somewhat ahead of its expected position with reference to the number of undergraduate students aided by scholarships.

---

[3] Theresa Birch Wilkins, Financial Aid for College Students: Undergraduate. U. S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Bulletin 1957, No. 18, p. 2.

[4] Ibid.

Calculation from the data of Table 1 shows that in the State-controlled institutions of Michigan 37.5 per cent of the scholarship funds available in 1956-57 were obtained from general institutional funds, 12.3 per cent from endowment income, almost 8 per cent through State government arrangements, and 42.2 per cent from private gifts (including grants from foundations and the Federal Government). In the community colleges the two main sources of funds for scholarship purposes are general institutional funds (32.3 per cent) and private gifts (65.4 per cent). In the privately controlled institutions, 38.1 per cent of the funds available for scholarships came from general institutional funds, 16.4 per cent from endowment, and 45.5 per cent from private gifts. From these data it is evident that all three groups of institutions obtain similar percentages of their scholarship funds from their general institutional funds. Both the privately controlled and the State-controlled groups of institutions derive a substantial percentage of their scholarship funds from endowments, while the community colleges get practically nothing for scholarships from endowed funds. In each of the three groups of institutions private gifts are the largest single source of funds available for scholarship purposes.

Data similar to those of Table 1 are shown for each individual institution in each of the three groups -- State-controlled, privately controlled, and community colleges -- respectively, in Tables 2, 3, and 4.

There is a wide variation among the individual institutions in the amount of scholarship funds available per full-time-equivalent student. For the State-controlled institutions, the low is $6.11 at Wayne State University; the high of

Table 2. Amount and Source of Funds Available for Scholarships during 1956-57 in the State-controlled Institutions of Michigan.

Institution	No. of Full-time-equivalent Students Enrolled	From General Institutional Funds		From Restricted Endowment Earnings		From State Government		From Private Gifts		Total Amount	Total Amount per F.T.E. Student
		Amount	Amount per F.T.E. Student	Amount	Amount per F.T.E. Student	Amount	Amount per F.T.E. Student	Amount	Amount per F.T.E. Student		
Central Mich. Col.	3,219	$ 0	$ 0	$ 1,006	$ 0.31	$ 59,337	$18.43	$ 8,945	$ 2.78	$ 69,288	$21.52
Eastern Mich. Col.	3,499	825	0.24	0	0	68,495	19.57	3,507	1.00	72,827	20.81
Ferris Institute	1,511	0	0	0	0	14,190	9.39	3,923	2.60	18,113	11.99
Mich. Col. M.&T. (Houghton)	2,150	49,933	23.22	0	0	0	0	34,678	16.13	84,611	39.35
Mich. Col. M.&T. (Sault Branch)	380	8,852	23.29	0	0	0	0	2,770	7.29	11,622	30.58
Mich. State Univ.	17,786	416,480	23.41	63,984	3.60	0	0	229,785	12.92	710,249	39.93
Northern Mich. Col.	1,066	0	0	0	0	24,177	22.68	0	0	24,177	22.68
Univ. of Michigan*	20,951	497,450	23.74	250,919	11.98	0	0	751,281	35.86	1,499,650	71.58
Wayne State Univ.	12,622	18,610	1.48	1,421	0.11	0	0	57,069	4.52	77,100	6.11
Western Mich. Univ.	5,726	17,432	3.05	0	0	86,878	15.17	18,430	3.22	122,740	21.44
Totals	68,910	$1,009,582		$317,330		$253,077		$1,110,388		$2,690,377	$39.04
Per cent of Total		37.5		11.8		9.4		41.3			
Per F.T.E. Student			$14.65		$ 4.61		$ 3.67		$16.11		$39.04

* Does not include data for the Flint Branch of the University of Michigan

Table 3. Amount and Source of Funds Available for Scholarships during 1956-57 in the Privately Controlled Institutions of Michigan.

Institution	General Institutional Funds	Restricted Endowment Earnings	Private Gifts from Church, Alumni, and Other Sources	Total
P-12	$ 165	$41,489	$ 31,551	$ 73,205
P-70	2,952	20,009	34,077	57,038
P-19	0	0	50,000	50,000
P-95	27,655	4,475	15,870	48,000
P-68	21,366	5,200	8,400	34,966
P-53	22,400	0	7,500	29,900
P-16	23,778	0	4,473	28,251
P-72	14,700	0	2,585	17,285
P-33	12,410	750	3,472	16,632
P-38	2,400	0	13,670	16,070
P-78	2,775	0	11,487	14,262
P-88	7,720	1,449	3,000	12,169
P-17	7,862	1,340	0	9,202
P-11	8,000	0	520	8,520
P-83	0	0	7,895	7,895
P-58	2,550	0	5,050	7,600
P-30	1,500	0	6,042	7,542
P-37	5,930	0	312	6,242
P-79	4,745	0	480	5,225
P-13	4,156	0	1,000	5,156
P-50	2,710	0	0	2,710
P-41	0	0	2,450	2,450

Table 3 (Continued)

Institution	General Institutional Funds	Restricted Endowment Earnings	Private Gifts from Church, Alumni, and Other Sources	Total
P-44	$ 0	$ 1,050	$ 0	$ 1,050
P-84	0	0	342	342
P-18	0	0	115	115
P-60	0	0	0	0
P-42	0	0	0	0
P-24	0	0	0	0
P-64	0	0	0	0
P-77	0	0	0	0
P-10	0	0	0	0
Totals	$175,774	$75,762	$210,292	$461,828
Per cent of Total	38.1	16.4	45.5	
Per Full-time-equivalent student	$7.45	$3.21	$8.92	$19.47

Note: There were 23,579 full-time-equivalent students in privately controlled institutions during Fall term of 1956. Amounts per full-time-equivalent student are not shown for the individual institutions because of the understanding that the identity of the privately controlled institutions would not be revealed.

Table 4. Amount and Source of Funds Available for Scholarships during 1956-57 in the Community Colleges of Michigan.

Institution	No. of Full-time-equivalent Students Enrolled	From General Institutional Funds		From Restricted Endowment Earnings		From Private Gifts		Total Amount	Total Amount per F.T.E. Student
		Amount	Amount per F.T.E. Student	Amount	Amount per F.T.E. Student	Amount	Amount per F.T.E. Student		
Alpena	167.2	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 2,450	$14.65	$ 2,450	$14.65
Battle Creek	91.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bay City	985.0	600	0.61	0	0	2,330	2.36	2,930	2.97
Benton Harbor	380.1	1,450	3.81	0	0	0	0	1,450	3.81
Flint	2,247.9	1,635	0.73	875	0.39	6,961	3.09	9,471	4.21
Gogebic	105.9	0	0	0	0	1,836	17.34	1,836	17.34
Grand Rapids	1,215.0	2,250	1.85	134	0.11	1,806	1.49	4,190	3.45
Henry Ford	2,036.8	1,300	0.64	0	0	2,330	1.14	3,630	1.78
Highland Park	1,406.0	1,200	0.85	0	0	0	0	1,200	.85
Jackson	544.0	3,870	7.11	0	0	1,500	2.76	5,370	9.87
Muskegon	601.4	0	0	0	0	4,875	8.11	4,875	8.11
Northwestern	304.1	0	0	0	0	4,890	16.08	4,890	16.08
Port Huron	539.0	1,100	2.04	0	0	0	0	1,100	2.04
South Macomb	244.3	900	3.68	0	0	0	0	900	3.68
Totals	10,867.8	$14,305		$1,009		$28,978		$44,292	$ 4.08
Per cent of Total		32.3		2.3		65.4			
Per F.T.E. Student			$1.32		$0.09		$ 2.67		$ 4.08

$71.58 is reported for the University of Michigan. In the privately controlled institutions, a high of over $500 is reported, with a low of zero in several of the institutions that reported no funds available for scholarships. In the community colleges, the highs for the average amount available per full-time-equivalent student are $17.34 at Gogebic (Ironwood) and $16.08 at Northwestern (Traverse City); in both cases the funds are derived entirely from private gifts. The low among the community colleges is at Battle Creek, which reported no scholarship funds available in 1956-57, the first year of the institution's operation.

It is interesting to note the variation in the extent to which the different publicly controlled institutions have obtained funds from private sources for scholarship purposes. Some of the State-controlled institutions, particularly the University of Michigan, Michigan State University, and the Michigan College of Mining and Technology (Houghton), and certain of the community colleges, particularly Gogebic (Ironwood), Northwestern (Traverse City), and Alpena, have been notably successful in obtaining relatively large amounts, per student enrolled, for scholarship purposes. At the other end of the scale, Northern Michigan College among the State-controlled institutions, and five of the community colleges, report no scholarships available in 1956-57 from private gifts. In most of the publicly controlled institutions, other than those named above, the amounts of scholarship funds available from private gifts are rather small, per full-time-equivalent student. It would seem that the officials of most of these institutions might well be encouraged to seek gifts for scholarship purposes from private sources within their respective communities and among the alumni and friends of the institutions.

Scholarship Awards Made during 1956-57

The preceding section has dealt with amounts and sources of funds that were available in the several institutions for making scholarship awards in 1956-57. This section of the chapter summarizes data concerning the actual awards made during the year. The total number and amounts of scholarships awarded during the 1956-57 academic year have been analyzed in terms of the number and amount awarded to students at three different academic levels: (1) freshmen only; (2) undergraduates other than entering freshmen; and (3) graduate students. For each of the institutions, calculations were made of the average amount awarded per recipient, the average amount per full-time-equivalent student, and the average number of awards per 1,000 full-time-equivalent students. Summaries were made for each institution and totals obtained for the three types of institutions.

Table 5 shows that the total number of awards made by the reporting institutions in 1956-57 was 13,756. These awards totaled $3,154,983, averaging $229.35 per recipient and $30.53 per full-time-equivalent student. An average of 133 awards were made per 1,000 full-time-equivalent students enrolled. Of the 13,756 scholarship grants made during the year, 11,509, or 83.7 per cent, were granted by the State-controlled institutions, 13.4 per cent by privately controlled institutions, and 2.9 per cent by the community colleges.

Awards to Students at Different Academic Levels

Of the 13,756 scholarship awards made, 26.7 per cent were made to freshmen, 65.9 per cent to other undergraduates, and 7.4 per cent to graduate students. Of the $3,154,983 awarded, 19.3 per cent went to freshmen, 53.5 per cent to other undergraduates, and 27.2 per cent to graduate students. Graduate students had the

Table 5. Total Number and Amount of Scholarships Awarded during 1956-57 in the Three Types of Institutions in Michigan, According to the Academic Level of the Recipient.

Type of Institution	Full-time-equivalent Enrollment	Awards		Funds		Average Award per Recipient	Average Amount of Award per F.T.E. Student	Average Number of Awards per 1,000 F.T.E. Students
		Number	Per Cent	Amount	Per Cent			
State-controlled								
Freshmen only		2,683	23.3	$ 427,974	15.9	$159.51		
Other undergraduates		7,860	68.3	1,442,299	53.6	183.50		
Graduates		966	8.4	822,074	30.5	851.01		
Totals	68,910	11,509	100.0	$2,692,347	100.0	$233.93	$39.07	167
Privately controlled								
Freshmen only		730	39.5	$ 150,330	35.9	$205.93		
Other undergraduates		1,073	58.0	232,030	55.3	216.24		
Graduates		46	2.5	36,949	8.8	803.24		
Totals	23,579	1,849	100.0	$ 419,309	100.0	$226.78	$17.78	78
Community colleges								
Freshmen only		265	66.6	$ 29,597	68.3	$111.69		
Other undergraduates		133	33.4	13,730	31.7	103.23		
Graduates		-	-	-	-	-		
Totals	10,868	398	100.0	$ 43,327	100.0	$108.86	$ 3.99	37
Totals								
Freshmen only		3,678	26.7	$ 607,901	19.3	$165.28		
Other undergraduates		9,066	65.9	1,688,059	53.5	186.20		
Graduates		1,012	7.4	859,023	27.2	848.84		
Totals	103,357	13,756	100.0	$3,154,983	100.0	$229.35	$30.53	133

largest average award per recipient, $848.84; the average to freshmen was $165.28, and to other undergraduates it was $186.20 per recipient.

The large difference between the average size of graduate and undergraduate awards perhaps needs explanation. As was pointed out previously, the awards to graduate students, many of which are designated as fellowships, are grants made to students pursuing a program that normally requires considerable time to be spent on research. This research is not only a matter of fulfilling the student's degree requirements but often the assigned or selected research project is part of a general, institutional research endeavor. Thus, the money expended for these fellowship grants provides the financial base for the student to devote his time to research and study without having to take on other types of employment elsewhere. At the same time, his research efforts may be of benefit to the institutional program.

Two other factors are responsible for the relatively large average size of the grants to graduate students. In the first place there is keen competition among the Nation's universities to attract the most able graduate students to their campuses. A university whose scholarship and fellowship grants for graduate students cannot match in size the grants offered in other institutions quickly loses out in the effort to attract able students and may soon become known as only a second or third rate graduate school.

In the second place, and more fundamental, is the fact that graduate students are older and more mature and have heavier financial responsibilities of their own than the typical undergraduate. Many graduate students are married and must provide at least a part of the support of their families while pursuing advanced study. Attractive job offers constantly tempt the graduate student to discontinue his advanced studies, so the program of financial assistance for graduate students must provide some competition with salary offers in well paying positions. Many graduate students have exhausted their own and their families' available resources in completing the four years of expensive undergraduate study and cannot continue without substantial financial assistance. Graduate study itself tends to be expensive for the student if he pays all his own bills for the research he must undertake, for the thesis he must prepare and file, and for the personal library he must normally begin to accumulate.

It is generally agreed that promising students should be encouraged to complete their graduate degrees at an early age, so that they may have the longest possible life of scholarly productivity. Thus the pattern of discontinuing full-time attendance upon receiving the Bachelor's degree, to take a position and to return later for graduate study, while followed by many students, is not usually recommended as the best way in which to encourage the maximum production of capable scholars. The services of men and women with the highest levels of preparation are so urgently needed by the State, the Nation, and the free world, that the investment in graduate scholarships and fellowships is fully justified.

Awards in the Different Kinds of Institutions

Table 5 presents some interesting differences among the three types of institutions. In the State-controlled institutions the ratio of the number of awards to freshmen to the number made to other undergraduates is approximately 1 to 3. For the privately controlled institutions, this ratio is only about 1 to 1.5. Or, put another way, of the 10,543 awards made to undergraduates by the State-controlled institutions, 25 per cent were made to freshmen and 75 per cent to other undergraduates. In the privately controlled institutions, of the 1,803 awards made to undergraduates, 40 per cent were made to freshmen and 60 per cent to other undergraduates. This difference is also evident when the amounts of money granted are considered.

According to Table 5, the average amounts of the awards per undergraduate recipient for the privately controlled institutions are about 30 per cent higher than for the State-controlled institutions. The average grant to freshmen in the privately controlled institutions was $205.93, while in the State-controlled institutions it was $159.51. Approximately the same relationship exists between the averages of the grants made to other undergraduates by these two types of institutions. The average grant in the community colleges was considerably less than at either the privately controlled or State-controlled institutions. The progression of the size of the average amount is related to the progression of tuitions charged at the three types of institutions, but it is by no means in direct proportion to the institutional tuitions. If this were so, the averages for the privately controlled institutions would have to be considerably higher.

Two other items of interest can be noted from Table 5. First, that the average amount of scholarship awarded per full-time-equivalent student enrolled for the State-controlled institutions is more than twice as large as for the privately controlled institutions, and almost ten times as large as the per student award at the community colleges. Secondly, the average number of awards per 1,000 full-time-equivalent students enrolled at the State-controlled institutions is more than twice as large as for the privately controlled institutions and almost five times as large as for the community colleges. It is clear that the scholarship programs at the privately controlled institutions are much less extensive than in the State-controlled institutions, in proportion to the numbers of students enrolled.

Some care should be exercised in drawing inferences from the preceding discussion and the data of Table 5. In addition to the facts cited above, certain other observations appear to be evident:

(1) The privately controlled institutions in general face a critical problem in the small average size of the grants made and the relatively small number available in proportion to the number of students enrolled. One should hasten to add, however, that several of the privately controlled institutions are doing comparatively well in providing financial assistance in the form of scholarships to their students. Several of the institutions have average grants per full-time-equivalent student of $40 or $50 or even more, which would indicate a better situation than the average seems to reflect. But, even in these instances, means should be found to increase the funds for grants.

(2) It is important to recall in this connection that the major portion of scholarship funds used by the State-controlled institutions is derived from endowments and private gifts, including Federal grants.

(3) It is interesting to note the average amounts of awards per full-time-equivalent student in the publicly controlled (State institutions and community colleges) and the privately controlled institutions of Michigan, as compared to the national figures. In Michigan the average award per full-time-equivalent student in the publicly controlled institutions is $34.27; in the privately controlled institutions it is $17.78. The corresponding national figures for 1953-54 were $27.00 for publicly controlled institutions and $53.00 for privately controlled institutions. The comparison of the two figures for the privately controlled institutions further emphasizes the need for the private institutions in Michigan to obtain additional support for their scholarship programs.

Awards in Individual State-controlled Institutions

Table 6 summarizes data for the individual State-controlled institutions regarding the number and amount of scholarship awards made, according to the academic level of the recipient. All but two of the institutions, Central Michigan College and the Sault Ste. Marie Branch of Michigan College of Mining and Technology (which offers only a lower division program), granted a higher percentage of their awards to undergraduates other than freshmen than the percentage of awards granted to freshmen. In the four institutions under the State Board of Education -- Central Michigan College, Eastern Michigan College, Northern Michigan College, and Western Michigan University -- the percentages of awards granted to freshmen were very similar except for the relatively high percentage at Central Michigan College. Wayne State University and Michigan State University each granted to freshmen 24 per cent of the total awards, but the University of Michigan, with its very different distribution of students at the various instructional levels, granted only 11 per cent of its scholarships to freshmen.

There is considerable variation among the State-controlled institutions in the amount of the average award per recipient. For entering freshmen, this average varies from a low of $76.92 per recipient at Ferris Institute to highs of $246.93 at Michigan State University and $240.82 at the University of Michigan. The averages per recipient at Central Michigan College, Eastern Michigan College, Northern Michigan College, and Western Michigan University are very similar, a situation that probably results from the fact that the major portion of scholarship funds in these institutions is in the form of tuition scholarships under an arrangement with the State Legislature.

Although average size of grants per recipient to undergraduates other than freshmen are similar to the amounts computed for entering freshmen, in general,

Table 6. Total Number and Amount of Scholarships Awarded during 1956-57 in the State-controlled Institutions in Michigan.

Institution	Awards		Average Award per Recipient	Average Amount of Award per F.T.E. Student	Average Number of Awards per 1,000 F.T.E. Students
	Number	Amount			
Central Mich. Col.					
Freshmen only	395	$ 38,056	$ 96.34		
Other undergraduates	341	32,540	95.43		
Graduates	0	0	0		
Totals	736	$ 70,596	$ 95.92	$21.93	229.0
Full-time-equivalent enrollment = 3,219					
Eastern Mich. Col.					
Freshmen only	258	$ 23,510	$ 91.12		
Other undergraduates	587	49,317	84.02		
Graduates	0	0	0		
Totals	845	$ 72,827	$ 86.19	$20.81	241.5
Full-time-equivalent enrollment = 3,499					
Ferris Institute					
Freshmen only	83	$ 6,384	$ 76.92		
Other undergraduates	96	7,812	81.38		
Totals	179	$ 14,196	$ 79.31	$ 9.40	118.5
Full-time-equivalent enrollment = 1,511					
Mich. Tech. (Houghton)					
Freshmen only	226	$ 25,553	$ 113.07		
Other undergraduates	558	57,198	102.51		
Graduates	7	1,860	265.71		
Totals	791	$ 84,611	$ 106.97	$39.35	367.9
Full-time-equivalent enrollment = 2,150					
Mich. Tech. (Sault Br.)					
Freshmen only	69	$ 8,272	$ 119.88		
Other undergraduates	41	3,350	81.71		
Totals	110	$ 11,622	$ 105.65	$30.58	289.5
Full-time-equivalent enrollment = 380					

Table 6 (Continued)

Institution	Awards		Average Award per Recipient	Average Amount of Award per F.T.E. Student	Average Number of Awards per 1,000 F.T.E. Students
	Number	Amount			
Mich. State Univ.					
Freshmen only	553	$ 136,551	$ 246.93		
Other undergraduates	1,727	461,428	267.18		
Graduates	98	108,252	1,104.61		
Totals	2,378	$ 706,231	$ 296.99	$39.71	133.7
Full-time-equivalent enrollment = 17,786					
Northern Mich. Col.					
Freshmen only	81	$ 7,695	$ 95.00		
Other undergraduates	173	16,482	95.27		
Graduates	0	0	0		
Totals	254	$ 24,177	$ 95.19	$22.68	238.3
Full-time-equivalent enrollment = 1,066					
Univ. of Michigan					
Freshmen only	490	$ 118,000	$ 240.82		
Other undergraduates	3,070	680,600	221.69		
Graduates	840	701,050	834.58		
Totals	4,400	$1,499,650	$ 340.83	$71.58	210.0
Full-time-equivalent enrollment = 20,951					
Wayne State Univ.					
Freshmen only	148	$ 20,915	$ 141.32		
Other undergraduates	460	53,773	116.90		
Graduates	9	1,912	212.44		
Totals	617	$ 76,600	$ 124.15	$ 6.07	48.9
Full-time-equivalent enrollment = 12,622					
Western Mich. Univ.					
Freshmen only	380	$ 43,038	$ 113.26		
Other undergraduates	807	79,799	98.88		
Graduates	12	9,000	750.00		
Totals	1,199	$ 131,837	$ 109.96	$23.02	209.4
Full-time-equivalent enrollment = 5,726					
TOTALS					
Freshmen only	2,683	$ 427,974	$ 159.51		
Other undergraduates	7,860	1,442,299	183.50		
Graduates	966	822,074	851.01		
Totals	11,509	$2,692,347	$ 233.93	$39.07	167.0

most of the State-controlled institutions made slightly larger average grants to freshmen than to other undergraduates. Exceptions to this are Ferris Institute, Michigan State University, and Northern Michigan College, but the differences in two of these three institutions are not large. In general, the analysis shows no evidence of any tendency in the State-controlled institution to use large scholarship awards as a bait to attract a large enrollment of entering freshmen.

The average grants at the graduate level, at those institutions which offer graduate work, are considerably higher than at the undergraduate level. There are, also, some very pronounced differences among the several institutions. The highest average grant per graduate student recipient is $1,104.61 at Michigan State University. The average grant at the University of Michigan is $834.58, $750.00 at Western Michigan University, $265.71 at Michigan College of Mining and Technology, and $212.44 at Wayne State University. It would normally be expected that the average award to graduate students would be much larger in the institutions offering the Ph.D. or equivalent degrees, than in those offering only the Master's degree. The University of Michigan, Michigan State University, and Wayne State University are the only institutions in Michigan offering programs leading to degrees of the Ph.D. level.

The results of the computations of the average amount of awards per full-time-equivalent student must be interpreted with caution because of the differences introduced at those institutions which have graduate scholarships and fellowships. The fact that these grants are normally larger than undergraduate awards will tend to increase the average values per full-time-equivalent student. One fact which is quite evident from Table 6 is that the average amounts of the awards per full-time-equivalent student at Ferris Institute and Wayne State University are appreciably lower than at any of the other State-controlled institutions. In the average number of awards per 1,000 full-time-equivalent students, Wayne State University is also noticeably lower than any of the other institutions. The institution with the highest number of awards per 1,000 full-time-equivalent students is Michigan College of Mining and Technology at Houghton.

Awards in Individual Community Colleges

As shown in Table 7, the major portion of scholarships granted by the community colleges are to entering freshmen. This reflects the relative number of freshmen and sophomores enrolled at these institutions. Of the 398 scholarships granted during 1956-57, 265, or 67 per cent, were awarded to entering freshmen. The average amount per freshman recipient was approximately $111, with a low of $51.61 at Bay City Junior College, and a high of $200 at Muskegon Community College and Highland Park Junior College. Similarly, rather wide variations are evident in the average amounts of awards per full-time-equivalent student, ranging from a low of $0.85 at Highland Park Junior College to a high of $17.34 at Gogebic Community College. The average number of awards per 1,000 full-time-equivalent students varies from a low of 4.3 at Highland Park Junior College to a high of 188.9 at Gogebic Community College. It is clear from Table 7 that the community colleges of Michigan show wide differences in the scope of their scholarship programs.

Awards in Individual Privately Controlled Institutions

Table 8 shows the data on scholarship awards made during 1956-57 in each of the privately controlled institutions participating in the study. There is a wide variation among the several institutions in the average size of award per recipient. The average size of grant for undergraduates at the privately controlled institutions

Table 7. Total Number and Amount of Scholarships Awarded during 1956-57 in the Community Colleges in Michigan.

Institution	Awards		Average Award per Recipient	Average Amount of Award per F.T.E. Student	Average Number of Awards per 1,000 F.T.E. Students
	Number	Amount			
Alpena					
Freshmen only	18	$ 2,170	$120.56		
Other undergraduates	2	280	140.00		
Totals	20	$ 2,450	$122.50	$14.65	119.6
Full-time-equivalent enrollment = 167.2					
Battle Creek	No scholarship funds reported.				
Full-time-equivalent enrollment = 91.1					
Bay City					
Freshmen only	31	$ 1,600	$ 51.61		
Other undergraduates	24	1,330	55.42		
Totals	55	$ 2,930	$ 53.27	$ 2.97	55.8
Full-time-equivalent enrollment = 985.0					
Benton Harbor					
Freshmen only	15	$ 1,450	$ 96.67		
Other undergraduates	-	-	-		
Totals	15	$ 1,450	$ 96.67	$ 3.81	39.5
Full-time-equivalent enrollment = 380.1					
Flint					
Freshmen only	54	$ 5,465	$101.20		
Other undergraduates	42	4,006	95.38		
Totals	96	$ 9,471	$ 98.66	$ 4.21	42.7
Full-time-equivalent enrollment = 2,247.9					
Gogebic					
Freshmen only	14	$ 1,386	$ 99.00		
Other undergraduates	6	450	75.00		
Totals	20	$ 1,836	$ 91.80	$17.34	188.9
Full-time-equivalent enrollment = 105.9					

Table 7 (Continued)

Institution	Awards		Average Award per Recipient	Average Amount of Award per F.T.E. Student	Average Number of Awards per 1,000 F.T.E. Students
	Number	Amount			
Grand Rapids					
Freshmen only	34	$ 3,191	$ 93.85		
Other undergraduates	4	509	127.25		
Totals	38	$ 3,700	$ 97.37	$ 3.05	31.3
Full-time-equivalent enrollment = 1,215.0					
Henry Ford					
Freshmen only	16	$ 2,300	$143.75		
Other undergraduates	11	1,330	120.91		
Totals	27	$ 3,630	$134.44	$ 1.78	13.3
Full-time-equivalent enrollment = 2,036.8					
Highland Park					
Freshmen only	6	$ 1,200	$200.00		
Other undergraduates	-	-	-		
Totals	6	$ 1,200	$200.00	$ 0.85	4.3
Full-time-equivalent enrollment = 1,406.0					
Jackson					
Freshmen only	18	$ 2,685	$149.17		
Other undergraduates	18	2,685	149.17		
Totals	36	$ 5,370	$149.17	$ 9.87	66.2
Full-time-equivalent enrollment = 544.0					
Muskegon					
Freshmen only	19	$ 3,800	$200.00		
Other undergraduates	3	600	200.00		
Totals	22	$ 4,400	$200.00	$ 7.32	36.6
Full-time-equivalent enrollment = 601.4					

Table 7 (Continued)

Institution	Awards		Average Award per Recipient	Average Amount of Award per F.T.E. Student	Average Number of Awards per 1,000 F.T.E. Students
	Number	Amount			
Northwestern					
Freshmen only	27	$ 3,150	$116.67		
Other undergraduates	15	1,740	116.00		
Totals	42	$ 4,890	$116.43	$16.08	138.1
Full-time-equivalent enrollment = 304.1					
Port Huron					
Freshmen only	3	$ 300	$100.00		
Other undergraduates	8	800	100.00		
Totals	11	$ 1,100	$100.00	$ 2.04	20.4
Full-time-equivalent enrollment = 539.0					
South Macomb					
Freshmen only	10	$ 900	$ 90.00		
Other undergraduates	-	-	-		
Totals	10	$ 900	$ 90.00	$ 3.69	41.0
Full-time-equivalent enrollment = 244.2					
TOTALS					
Freshmen only	265	$29,597	$111.69		
Other undergraduates	133	13,730	103.23		
Totals	398	$43,327	$108.86	$ 3.99	36.6

Table 8. Average Amount and Number of Scholarships Awarded during 1956-57 in the Privately Controlled Institutions in Michigan.

Institution	Average Award per Recipient	Average Amount of Award per F.T.E. Student	Average Number of Awards per 1,000 F.T.E. Students
P-30			
Freshmen only	$ 115.60		
Other undergraduates	109.76		
Graduates	100.50		
Totals	$ 112.38	$ 74.18	660.2
P-53			
Freshmen only	$ -		
Other undergraduates	54.33		
Graduates	1,155.71		
Totals	$ 935.43	$522.59	559.1
P-37			
Freshmen only	$ 85.73		
Other undergraduates	60.82		
Totals	$ 82.12	$ 45.49	553.9
P-68			
Freshmen only	$ 120.00		
Other undergraduates	140.56		
Totals	$ 135.00	$ 50.98	377.6
P-95			
Freshmen only	$ 167.56		
Other undergraduates	176.48		
Totals	$ 172.66	$ 48.24	279.4
P-12			
Freshmen only	$ 209.33		
Other undergraduates	210.09		
Totals	$ 209.79	$ 57.42	273.7
P-33			
Freshmen only	$ 191.50		
Other undergraduates	182.67		
Totals	$ 185.55	$ 48.09	259.2

Table 8 (Continued)

Institution	Average Award per Recipient	Average Amount of Award per F.T.E. Student	Average Number of Awards per 1,000 F.T.E. Students
P-83			
Freshmen only	$ 192.31		
Other undergraduates	207.14		
Totals	$ 197.50	$ 46.94	237.7
P-13			
Freshmen only	$ 100.00		
Other undergraduates	17.31		
Totals	$ 57.00	$ 10.40	182.5
P-88			
Freshmen only	$ 231.73		
Other undergraduates	256.25		
Totals	$ 304.38	$ 42.20	173.3
P-38			
Freshmen only	$ 400.00		
Other undergraduates	327.21		
Totals	$ 334.79	$ 41.52	124.0
P-78			
Freshmen only	$ 168.42		
Other undergraduates	143.66		
Totals	$ 148.56	$ 18.17	122.3
P-11			
Freshmen only	$ -		
Other undergraduates	266.67		
Graduates	877.50		
Totals	$ 710.91	$ 68.90	96.9
P-72			
Freshmen only	$ 290.38		
Other undergraduates	286.32		
Totals	$ 288.08	$ 23.87	82.9

Table 8 (Continued)

Institution	Average Award per Recipient	Average Amount of Award per F.T.E. Student	Average Number of Awards per 1,000 F.T.E. Students
P-44			
Freshmen only	$ 395.00		
Other undergraduates	542.78		
Totals	$ 505.83	$ 27.16	53.7
P-58			
Freshmen only	$ 291.67		
Other undergraduates	372.73		
Totals	$ 330.43	$ 16.59	50.2
P-16			
Freshmen only	$ 420.00		
Other undergraduates	396.21		
Totals	$ 405.65	$ 15.92	39.3
P-79			
Freshmen only	$ 117.92		
Other undergraduates	127.34		
Totals	$ 124.43	$ 4.43	35.6
P-70			
Freshmen only	$ 356.86		
Other undergraduates	320.68		
Graduates	231.33		
Totals	$ 329.71	$ 8.11	24.6
P-50			
Freshmen only	$ -		
Other undergraduates	903.33		
Totals	$ 903.33	$ 18.07	20.0
P-41			
Freshmen only	$ 294.29		
Other undergraduates	390.00		
Totals	$ 306.25	$ 5.98	19.5

Table 8 (Continued)

Institution	Average Award per Recipient	Average Amount of Award per F.T.E. Student	Average Number of Awards per 1,000 F.T.E. Students
P-17			
Freshmen only	$ 245.69		
Other undergraduates	-		
Totals	$ 245.69	$ 4.61	18.8
P-84			
Freshmen only	$ -		
Other undergraduates	63.32		
Totals	$ 63.32	$ 1.03	16.3
P-18			
Freshmen only	$ -		
Other undergraduates	57.50		
Totals	$ 57.50	$ 0.64	11.1
P-19			
Freshmen only	(Number of awards		
Other undergraduates	not reported)		
Totals		$ 37.56	-
P-10	No scholarship funds reported.		
P-60	No scholarship funds reported.		
P-42	No scholarship funds reported.		
P-24	No scholarship funds reported.		
P-64	No scholarship funds reported.		
TOTALS			
Freshmen only	$ 205.93		
Other undergraduates	216.24		
Graduates	803.24		
Totals	$ 226.78	$ 17.78	78.4

is about $210.00; thirteen institutions have average grants above this figure and eleven have lower averages, while four other institutions report having made no scholarship grants. These data point up the critical problem which most of the privately controlled institutions face in their needs for additional funds to make scholarships available to able and worthy students.

Size of Scholarship Grants

This section of the study presents an analysis of the number and percentage of students receiving scholarship grants according to size of the grant. Table 9 shows that the institutions participating in the study reported individual scholarship grants during 1956-57 that ranged in size from less than $50 to more than $2,500.

The State-controlled and the privately controlled institutions do not differ much in the percentage of their total scholarship awards that were less than $200, having 57 per cent and 54 per cent, respectively, of their total awards in the size groups below $200. The community colleges, however, make 89 per cent of their scholarship awards in amounts below $200. In the size brackets above $200 the State-controlled and the privately controlled institutions differ sharply in the distribution of their scholarship awards. Grants of less than $300 constituted 92.5 per cent of the awards in the State-controlled institutions but only 77.2 per cent in the privately controlled group. Grants in each of the size groups between $300 and $800 were relatively much more frequent in the privately controlled than in the State-controlled institutions.

The significance of the difference in the distribution between the privately controlled and the State-controlled institutions is all the more striking when one considers the fact that the data for the State-controlled institutions include the relatively

Table 9. Number and Percentage of Students Receiving Scholarship Grants of Each Size, 1956-57.

	State Institutions		Private Institutions		Community Colleges		Totals	
	Number	Per cent of Total Number	Number	Per cent of Total Number	Number	Per cent of Total Number	Number	Per cent of Total Number
Less than $50	253	2.20	80	4.31	0	0	333	2.42
50-99	3,884	33.73	282	15.21	109	27.39	4,275	31.06
100-199	2,445	21.24	641	34.57	245	61.55	3,331	24.20
200-299	4,065	35.31	429	23.14	44	11.06	4,538	32.97
300-399	200	1.74	167	9.01	0	0	367	2.67
400-499	60	0.52	136	7.34	0	0	196	1.42
500-599	102	0.88	48	2.59	0	0	150	1.09
600-799	101	0.88	27	1.46	0	0	128	0.93
800-999	92	0.80	14	0.76	0	0	106	0.77
1000-1499	183	1.59	24	1.29	0	0	207	1.50
1500-2500	123	1.07	5	0.27	0	0	128	0.93
More than $2500	5	0.04	1	0.05	0	0	6	0.04
Totals	11,513	100.00	1,854	100.00	398	100.00	13,765 (1)	100.00

(1) The minor differences between the totals in several of the tables result from slight discrepancies in the reports from several institutions.

large scholarship and fellowship grants made at the graduate level in several of these institutions. Even with this difference, however, the greater percentage of larger grants in the privately controlled institutions does not appear to be adequate to balance out the proportionately larger tuition costs at the privately controlled institutions.

In the opinion of the writer, a well administered institutional program of scholarship assistance should be characterized by considerable diversity in the sizes of the individual grants. A major purpose of the grants is to assist students to overcome financial barriers to college attendance. These barriers are not of equal height for all students. Some students need only a small amount of help to make the difference between being able to attend and not being able to attend college. Other students may need varying amounts of help, up to what would represent possibly the entire cost of college attendance in some cases. A well administered program, operated on the policy of getting the largest possible values from the funds available, will adjust the size of the individual grants closely to the needs of the recipients. It is recognizedly easier, administratively, to make all grants of approximately the same size without reference to the needs of the individual recipient, but such a procedure inevitably means that some students will be granted more than is necessary to permit them to attend college, while others do not attend at all because the amount of the available award is insufficient to meet their minimum needs.

With this point of view in mind, it is interesting to examine the distribution of scholarship awards according to size in each of the Michigan institutions. The data for each institution in each of the three groups are shown in the following tables.

A summary of the number of students receiving scholarships of each size for each of the State-controlled institutions is shown in Table 10. The University of Michigan and Michigan State University, with their extensive graduate scholarship programs, have distributions ranging from the lowest to the highest intervals. The distribution for Wayne State University, the only other institution offering a program at the Ph.D. level, is markedly less extensive at the higher intervals. Of the four institutions with a teacher preparation emphasis, Western Michigan University appears to have the most diversified distribution of scholarship grants. Northern Michigan College, with all its scholarship awards in the one interval between $50 and $99, might do well to study its program in an effort to develop a system of grants more diversified in size. The same suggestion applies also to Eastern Michigan College, and to a somewhat lesser degree to Ferris Institute and Central Michigan College.

Table 11 shows the data for distribution of scholarship grants according to size for each of the privately controlled institutions participating in the study. A number of these institutions show a very good spread in their distribution of scholarship awards among the various size groups. A few, however, make practically all their awards in sizes with only a narrow range in amounts.

Similar data are shown for the community colleges in Table 12. None of the community colleges reports a grant of as much as $300. Because of the nature of the clientele served by the community colleges, these institutions probably do not need to make any grants of large size. Several of the community colleges, however, confine their scholarship awards to a narrow range of amounts and might well consider a broader diversification in the size of the grants.

Table 10. Number of Students Receiving Scholarship Grants of Each Size -- State-controlled Institutions -- 1956-57.

Institution	Less than $50	$50-99	$100-199	$200-299	$300-399	$400-499	$500-599	$600-799	$800-999	$1000-1499	$1500-2500	More than $2500	Total
Central Mich. Col.	10	683	14	3	1	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	715
Eastern Mich. Col.	17	817	9	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	845
Ferris Institute	0	164	3	3	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	174
Mich. Col. M.&T. (Houghton)	128	480	111	19	4	4	31	8	3	3	0	0	791
Mich. Col. M.&T. (Sault Branch)	2	90	13	3	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	110
Mich. State Univ.	20	48	52	2,028	13	30	28	9	52	140	2	0	2,422
Northern Mich. Col.	0	254	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	254
Univ. of Michigan	0	120	1,850	1,950	180	20	20	60	35	40	120	5	4,400
Wayne State Univ.	11	216	336	39	0	2	9	4	0	0	1	0	618
Western Mich. Univ.	65	1,012	57	18	2	2	11	16	1	0	0	0	1,184
Totals	253	3,884	2,445	4,065	200	60	102	101	92	183	123	5	11,513
Per cent of total	2.2	33.7	21.3	35.3	1.7	0.5	0.9	0.9	0.8	1.6	1.1	*	

* Less than 0.05 per cent.

Table 11. Number of Students Receiving Scholarship Grants of Each Size -- Privately Controlled Institutions -- 1956-57.

Institution	Less than $50	$50-99	$100-199	$200-299	$300-399	$400-499	$500-599	$600-799	$800-999	$1000-1499	$1500-2500	More than $2500	Total
P-12	3	26	166	101	6	16	16	6	6	3			349
P-95	2	30	144	58	22	11	6	3					276
P-68	50	76	85	36	2	5	8	0	0	2			264
P-70	6	2	39	48	22	21	12	15	4	3	1		173
P-78	1	46	30	7	8	0	2	0	2				96
P-33	0	8	31	34	4	10							87
P-37	0	57	21										78
P-30	11	6	44	3	3								67
P-16	0	0	0	1	0	62							63
P-72	0	0	1	6	53								60
P-88	0	0	5	37	3	5							50
P-38	0	0	16	4	23	4	0	0	0	1			48
P-79	4	7	24	7									42
P-83	0	0	2	37	1								40
P-17	0	0	2	30									32
P-53	1	9	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	11	4	1	30
P-13	0	13	12										25
P-44	0	0	10	0	14								24
P-58	0	0	0	14	2	2	3	2					23
P-11	0	0	1	2	3	0	1	0	0	4			11
P-41	0	0	7	0	1								8
P-84	1	1	1										3
P-50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2				3
P-18	1	1											2
Totals	80	282	641	429	167	136	48	27	14	24	5	1	1,854
Per cent of Total	4.3	15.2	34.6	23.1	9.0	7.4	2.6	1.4	0.8	1.3	0.2	0.1	

Note: P-60, P-24, P-42, P-64,
P-77, and P-10 reported no awards.

P-19 did not report on the size of awards made.

Table 12. Number of Students Receiving Scholarship Grants of Each Size -- Community Colleges -- 1956-57.

Institution	$50 - 99	$100-199	$200-299.	Totals
Alpena	2	15	3	20
Bay City	54	1	0	55
Benton Harbor	15	0	0	15
Flint	11	71	14	96
Gogebic	11	9	0	20
Grand Rapids	7	15	16	38
Henry Ford	0	26	1	27
Highland Park	0	0	6	6
Jackson	0	32	4	36
Muskegon	4	18	0	22
Northwestern	0	42	0	42
Port Huron	0	11	0	11
South Macomb	5	5	0	10
Totals	109	245	44	398
Per Cent of Total	27.4	61.6	11.0	100.0

Note: Battle Creek reported no funds.

Table 13 relates the size of the scholarship grants in the three types of institutions to the institutional tuition fee and the source of the funds. For all the reporting colleges and universities, 51 per cent of the awards made were just equal to the institution's tuition fee. In the State-controlled institutions, 57 per cent of the grants were equal to the tuition fee, in the privately controlled schools, only 18 per cent of the grants were equal in size to the tuition fee, while in the community colleges 31 per cent of the grants were equal to the institutional tuition fee. In the State-controlled institutions, 11.6 per cent of the grants were greater than the tuition fee. In the privately controlled institutions and the community colleges only 7 per cent of the grants were greater than the tuition fee. In all the institutions combined 62.3 per cent of the scholarship awards were keyed in amount to the institution's tuition fee or some specified fraction thereof. Such a policy makes for inflexibility in the scholarship program and tends to make it difficult to adjust the size of the award very precisely to the needs of the student.

In the community colleges 83 per cent of the grants are made from funds restricted to scholarship purposes. In the State-controlled institutions slightly more than half of the grants are made from general institutional funds, while in the privately controlled institutions a majority of the grants are made from funds restricted to scholarship purposes.

Scholarship awards from general, unrestricted, institutional funds, when made in an amount equal to tuition or some fraction thereof, are usually simply a remission of fees. In other words, the institution admits the student without collecting the usual tuition fee and thereby designates him as a "scholar." The grant of a "scholarship" of this sort from general unrestricted institutional funds

Table 13. Number of Scholarship Grants Awarded, Classified According to the Size of the Award in Relation to the Institutional Tuition Charge, in the Three Types of Michigan Institutions during 1956-57.

	State Institutions		Private Institutions		Community Colleges		Totals	
	From General Institutional Funds	From Funds Restricted to Scholarship Purposes	From General Institutional Funds	From Funds Restricted to Scholarship Purposes	From General Institutional Funds	From Funds Restricted to Scholarship Purposes	Total Number of Scholarships	Per cent of Total Number
a. Just equal to the institution's tuition fee	5,192	1,408	171	158	37	90	7,056	51.14
b. Half the amount of the institution's tuition fee	83	955	55	50	0	20	1,163	8.43
c. Some other specified fraction of the tuition fee	93	160	63	38	15	8	377	2.73
d. Less than the tuition fee, but no specified fraction	510	1,808	443	736	14	182	3,693	26.77
e. Greater than the institution's tuition fee	242	1,104	41	91	0	29	1,508	10.93
Totals	6,120	5,435	773	1,073	66	329	13,797	100.00

in effect subtracts from the support the institution can provide for other important parts of its operating program, such as the payment of faculty salaries. It may logically be argued that scholarship grants from unrestricted institutional funds actually come, in the final analysis, from faculty salaries, if such grants involve funds that would otherwise be available for the improvement of faculty salaries.[5] Because of the great need in practically every college and university for all the funds that can possibly be obtained for the support of the operating educational program, the use of unrestricted institutional funds for scholarship purposes is a policy of questionable wisdom. It seems much wiser to obtain funds specifically for scholarship purposes, so that no charge can be made of a diversion of much needed support from faculty salaries and other features of the educational service.

In each of the three groups of Michigan institutions the awards of scholarships in amounts less than the tuition fee are preponderantly from funds restricted to scholarship purposes. This undoubtedly means that in many cases donors have provided funds for scholarship awards in amounts that are insufficient to cover the full tuition for a student. Such a situation is particularly apt to occur in the endowed type of scholarship, in cases where the endowment capital provided by the donor is not large enough to yield an income, under current conditions, that will permit the making of an award equal to at least the full amount of the tuition fee. In general, donors should be encouraged either to make gifts for scholarship purposes in such substantial amounts that the individual awards can be of adequate size, or else to permit the pooling of their gifts for scholarship purposes with the gifts of other donors so that the administration of the institution can make adjustments in fitting the size of the awards to the needs of the recipients.

---

[5] For an elaboration of this argument, see John Dale Russell, The Finance of Higher Education, Revised Edition (University of Chicago Press, 1954), pp. 227-30.

Restrictions on Scholarship Grants

This section of the report is concerned with the various qualifications and restrictions placed on scholarship awards. These restrictions take the form of general statements such as "for any undergraduate in good standing with the institution," or they may be very specific, indicating the sex of the recipient, financial need, place of residence, academic achievement, particular academic objective of the applicant, or special ability in such fields as dramatics, music, athletics, etc.

Restrictions on Financial Need and Academic Achievement

According to Tables 14, 15, 16, and 17, very few scholarships have no restrictions relating either to financial need or academic achievement of the recipient. Of the total amount of money granted as scholarships in all the reporting institutions, only 2 per cent was awarded without some qualification on either financial need or academic achievement. Such grants are available only at the two largest institutions, Michigan State University and the University of Michigan. Of the total amount awarded, 38.4 per cent was for scholarships carrying some restriction on academic achievement, while 56.0 per cent carried restrictions involving both high academic achievement and financial need. Only 3.6 per cent of the amount awarded was restricted to financial need only.

Table 14. Number, Amount and Percentage of Awards Made in the Three Types of Institutions on the Basis of Prior Academic Achievement and Financial Need of the Recipient, 1956-57.

Type of Institution	No Restrictions Regarding Financial Need or Academic Achievement		Restricted to High Academic Achievement Only		Restricted to Financial Need Only		Restricted to Both High Academic Achievement and Financial Need		Totals	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
State-controlled	148	$33,786	2,521	$1,105,815	632	$ 47,206	8,549	$1,533,131	11,850	$2,719,938
Percentage	1.3	1.2	21.3	40.7	5.3	1.7	72.1	56.4	100.0	100.0
Privately controlled	155	28,354	346	110,972	376	66,225	987	208,360	1,864	413,911
Percentage	8.3	6.9	18.6	26.8	20.2	16.0	52.9	50.3	100.0	100.0
Community colleges	5	500	27	3,774	16	1,450	350	37,604	398	43,328
Percentage	1.3	1.2	6.8	8.7	4.0	3.3	87.9	86.8	100.0	100.0
All types of institutions combined	308	62,640	2,894	1,220,561	1,024	114,881	9,886	1,779,095	14,112	3,177,177
Percentage	2.2	2.0	20.5	38.4	7.3	3.6	70.0	56.0	100.0	100.0

Table 15. Number and Amount of Awards Made in State-controlled Institutions during 1956-57 on the Basis of Prior Academic Achievement and Financial Need of the Recipient.

Institution	No Restrictions on Financial Need or Academic Achievement		Restricted to High Academic Achievement		Restricted to Financial Need		Restricted to High Academic Achievement and Financial Need	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Central Mich. Col.	0	$ 0	0	$ 0	69	$ 4,606	667	$ 65,999
Eastern Mich. Col.	0	0	0	0	0	0	845	72,827
Ferris Institute	0	0	0	0	0	0	179	18,113
Mich. Col. M.&T. (Houghton)	0	0	0	0	0	0	791	84,611
Mich. Col. M.&T. (Sault Branch)	0	0	110	11,622	0	0	0	0
Mich. State Univ.	83	17,261	321	269,078	6	3,790	2,024	420,119
Northern Mich. Col.	0	0	254	24,178	0	0	0	0
Univ. of Michigan	65	16,525	843	702,550	0	0	3,492	780,575
Wayne State Univ.	0	0	0	0	557	38,810	360	58,490
Western Mich. Univ.	0	0	993	98,387	0	0	191	32,397
Total	148	$33,786	2,521	$1,105,815	632	$47,206	8,549	$1,533,131

Table 16. Number and Amount of Awards Made in Privately Controlled Institutions during 1956-57 on the Basis of Prior Academic Achievement and Financial Need of the Recipient.

Institution	No Restrictions on Financial Need or Academic Achievement		Restricted to High Academic Achievement		Restricted to Financial Need		Restricted to High Academic Achievement and Financial Need	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
P-12	4	$ 2,000	4	$ 2,000	141	$20,835	208	$ 50,380
P-95	0	0	11	2,400	40	4,175	227	41,425
P-68	0	0	4	2,000	12	825	243	32,141
P-70	44	15,509	8	1,733	79	16,332	42	23,465
P-78	0	0	5	1,500	0	0	91	12,762
P-88	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	12,175
P-33	0	0	27	6,080	0	0	59	9,677
P-44	0	0	11	2,845	0	0	13	9,295
P-58	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	7,600
P-41	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	2,450
P-11	0	0	5	6,000	0	0	6	1,820
P-50	0	0	0	0	1	790	2	1,920
P-72	0	0	45	12,985	9	2,700	6	1,600
P-30	37	3,575	5	700	18	1,917	9	1,450
P-37	35	2,130	32	2,480	15	1,633	0	0
P-13	25	1,425	0	0	0	0	0	0
P-53	0	0	30	28,063	0	0	0	0
P-38	0	0	5	2,000	43	14,070	0	0
P-83	0	0	40	7,900	0	0	0	0
P-16	8	3,600	55	21,955	0	0	0	0
P-84	0	0	0	0	3	190	0	0
P-79	0	0	27	2,468	15	2,758	0	0
P-18	2	115	0	0	0	0	0	0
P-17	0	0	32	7,863	0	0	0	0
Total	155	$28,354	346	$110,972	376	$66,225	987	$208,360

Note: P-60, P-42, P-24, P-64,
P-77, and P-10 made no awards.

Restriction awards not reported by P-19.

Table 17. Number and Amount of Awards Made in Community Colleges during 1956-57 on the Basis of Prior Academic Achievement and Financial Need of the Recipient.

Institution	No Restrictions on Financial Need or Academic Achievement		Restricted to High Academic Achievement		Restricted to Financial Need		Restricted to High Academic Achievement and Financial Need	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Alpena	0	$ 0	3	$ 600	0	$ 0	17	$ 1,850
Bay City	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	2,930
Benton Harbor	0	0	15	1,450	0	0	0	0
Flint	0	0	0	0	0	0	96	9,471
Gogebic	0	0	3	524	0	0	17	1,313
Grand Rapids	0	0	0	0	6	550	32	3,150
Henry Ford	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	3,630
Highland Park	0	0	6	1,200	0	0	0	0
Jackson	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	5,370
Muskegon	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	4,400
Northwestern	0	0	0	0	0	0	42	4,890
Port Huron	5	500	0	0	0	0	6	600
South Macomb	0	0	0	0	10	900	0	0
Totals	5	$500	27	$3,774	16	$1,450	350	$37,604

Note: Battle Creek reported no funds.

It will be noted in Table 14 that the percentage of the number of grants made on the basis of high academic achievement alone is considerably smaller than the percentage of the amounts that such grants are of the total scholarship awards. The reverse is true of the awards restricted to financial need only or the awards based on both financial need and high academic achievement. This means that, in general, the individual awards that are based solely on high academic achievement tend to be larger than those in which financial need is a basis for making the award.

For the individual institutions, there appear to be a variety of practices on restrictions related to need and academic achievement. Only two of the State-controlled institutions, Central Michigan College and Wayne State University, make any substantial awards based on financial need only, and only Michigan State University and the University of Michigan grant some scholarships without regard to either financial need or academic achievement. In the State-controlled institutions academic achievement is a basis of 93.4 per cent of the scholarship awards, and most of these awards are also based on the financial needs of the recipient. At five of the State-controlled institutions no awards are made on the basis of high academic achievement without regard to financial needs. Only one community college grants awards without regard to either need or achievement, and only two grant awards on the basis of financial need only. Four community colleges have awards that are based solely on academic achievement without regard to financial need.

The situation is not much different in the privately controlled institutions, except that half of them grant awards on the basis of financial need only. On the basis of these summaries, it appears that the granting of scholarship awards in the Michigan institutions is based rather firmly on the combination of academic ability and financial need.

Restrictions Related to Sex of Recipient

In all the institutions reporting in this study, there appear to be very few scholarship awards restricted either to men or to women (Table 18). Less than 6 per cent of the awards carried such a restriction. In the privately controlled institutions 11.4 per cent of the awards were restricted to women, 6.6 per cent to men, while only 3.6 per cent of all awards made in State-controlled institutions carried a restriction to men or women.

Table 18. Number, Amount, and Percentage of Awards Made in the Three Types of Institutions during 1956-57 on the Basis of the Sex of the Recipient.

	State-controlled Institutions			Privately Controlled Institutions			Community Colleges		
Restrictions	Number	Amount	Per Cent of Total Number	Number	Amount	Per Cent of Total Number	Number	Amount	Per Cent of Total Number
No Restrictions as to Sex	11,086	$2,576,845	96.4	1,526	$321,136	82.0	326	$34,504	81.5
Restricted to Men only	325	91,441	2.8	123	34,568	6.6	31	4,905	7.8
Restricted to Women only	90	26,646	0.8	211	55,150	11.4	43	4,118	10.7
Totals	11,501	$2,694,932	100.0	1,860	$410,854	100.0	400	$43,527	100.0

Restrictions Related to the Residence of Recipient

Various kinds of restrictions relating to the residence of recipients are to be found among the three types of institutions (Table 19). In the privately controlled institutions, 89.1 per cent of the amount awarded carried no restriction pertaining to the residence of the recipient; in the State-controlled institutions,

Table 19. Number, Amount, and Percentage of Scholarships Awarded Having Restrictions Related to the Residence of the Recipient in the Three Types of Institutions.

Residential Restrictions	State-controlled Institutions			Privately Controlled Institutions			Community Colleges		
	Number	Amount	Per Cent of Amount	Number	Amount	Per Cent of Amount	Number	Amount	Per Cent of Amount
No restrictions on residence	5,287	$1,505,263	55.4	1,728	$367,082	89.1	152	$15,304	36.2
Foreign students only	247	43,470	1.6	14	8,940	2.2	0	0	0
Non-residents of Michigan only	363	71,533	2.6	0	0	0	0	0	0
Residents of Michigan only	5,795	1,073,018	39.5	39	11,974	2.9	5	600	1.4
Residents of particular places in Michigan	65	17,757	0.7	58	13,600	3.3	241	26,424	62.4
Residents of particular places or areas outside of Michigan	14	4,330	0.2	21	10,315	2.5	0	0	0
Totals	11,771	$2,715,371	100.0	1,860	$411,911	100.0	398	$42,328	100.0

53.4 per cent of the amount awarded had no residence restrictions; in the community colleges, only 36.2 per cent of the amount awarded had no such restrictions. For the State-controlled institutions, 40.2 per cent of the amount awarded was specifically restricted to Michigan residents. In the community colleges, 62.4 per cent of the amount awarded was restricted to specific places in the State of Michigan, that is, either the school district or the immediate surrounding area of the community college. Both the privately controlled and State-controlled institutions have a few scholarship awards restricted to foreign students. Central Michigan College, Eastern Michigan College, Ferris Institute, and Northern Michigan College do not have such awards except as provided for in the State Board of Education Scholarships. In some of the State-controlled institutions, there are scholarships specifically designated for non-residents of Michigan. Most of these awards are from foundations, alumni groups, and other private sources. Central Michigan College, Eastern Michigan College, Ferris Institute, Northern Michigan College, Wayne State University, and Western Michigan University do not have such awards (Table 19, 20, 21, and 22).

Time Limitations and Repayment Obligations

Of the 13,092 awards on which information was reported with respect to time limits for which they may be held, 36 per cent are available for one year only. The other 64 per cent may be renewed for one or more additional years. These percentages do not vary appreciably for any of the three types of institutions (Table 23).

There are very few instances of repayment clauses relating to scholarships. Only two private institutions reported that one or more of their scholarship awards require repayment if the student transfers to another institution before

Table 20. Number and Amount of Scholarships Awarded Having Restrictions Related to the Residence of the Recipient, State-controlled Institutions, during 1956-57.

Institution	No Restrictions on Residence of Recipients		Foreign Students Only		Non-residents of Michigan Only		Residents of Michigan Only		Residents of Particular Places in Michigan		Residents of Particular Places or Areas Outside Michigan	
	No.	Amount	No.	Amount	No.	Amount	No.	Amount	No.	Amount	No.	Amount
Central Mich. Col.	0	$ 0	0	$ 0	0	$ 0	622	$ 59,090	4	$ 930	0	$ 0
Eastern Mich. Col.	68	3,592	0	0	0	0	772	68,495	5	740	0	0
Ferris Institute	0	0	0	0	0	0	178	18,113	1	200	0	0
Mich. Col. of M&T (Houghton)	47	25,412	73	9,685	146	16,295	598	42,904	12	4,550	7	1,900
Mich. Col. of M&T (Sault Branch)	0	0	2	1,080	3	684	105	9,858	0	0	2	1,080
Mich. State Univ.	668	200,287	58	11,743	87	16,704	1,769	464,580	15	4,457	4	1,200
Northern Mich. Col.	0	0	0	0	0	0	254	24,178	0	0	0	0
Univ. of Michigan	2,780	1,076,950	50	13,500	127	37,850	1,493	384,350	22	5,480	1	150
Wayne State Univ.	556	71,150	50	5,000	0	0	4	950	4	950	0	0
Western Mich. Univ.	1,168	127,372	14	2,462	0	0	0	0	2	450	0	0
Totals	5,287	$1,505,263	247	$43,470	363	$71,533	5,795	$1,073,018	65	$17,757	14	$4,330

Table 21. Number and Amount of Scholarships Awarded Having Restrictions Related to the Residence of the Recipient, Privately Controlled Institutions.

Institution	No Restrictions on Residence		Foreign Students Only		Residents of Michigan Only		Residents of Particular Places or Areas in Michigan		Residents of Particular Places or Areas Outside of Michigan	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
P-12	343	$ 68,125	0	$ 0	0	$ 0	2	$ 450	8	$ 4,640
P-95	278	48,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P-70	117	37,656	0	0	27	10,130	20	4,379	9	4,875
P-68	249	31,366	3	850	0	0	7	2,750	0	0
P-16	63	25,555	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P-53	24	22,063	6	6,000	0	0	0	0	0	0
P-72	58	16,885	0	0	0	0	2	400	0	0
P-38	48	16,070	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P-78	95	13,432	1	830	0	0	0	0	0	0
P-33	73	13,357	0	0	0	0	13	2,600	0	0
P-88	48	11,275	0	0	0	0	2	900	0	0
P-44	20	10,880	4	1,260	0	0	0	0	0	0
P-83	40	7,900	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P-17	32	7,863	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P-11	11	7,820	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P-37	82	6,242	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P-30	53	5,367	0	0	3	354	11	1,621	2	300
P-58	14	5,300	0	0	6	1,300	1	500	2	500
P-79	42	5,226	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P-50	3	2,710	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 21 (Continued)

Institution	No Restrictions on Residence		Foreign Students Only		Residents of Michigan Only		Residents of Particular Places or Areas in Michigan		Residents of Particular Places or Areas Outside of Michigan	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
P-41	8	$ 2,450	0	$ 0	0	$ 0	0	$ 0	0	$ 0
P-18	2	115	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P-84	0	0	0	0	3	190	0	0	0	0
P-13	25	1,425	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	1,728	$367,082	14	$8,940	39	$11,974	58	$13,600	21	$10,315

Note: P-6, P-42, P-24, P-64,
P-77, and P-10 reported no funds.

Restrictions not reported by P-19.

Table 22. Number and Amount of Scholarships Awarded Having Restrictions Related to the Residence of the Recipient, Community Colleges, during 1956-57.

Institution	No Restrictions on Residence		Residents of Michigan Only		Residents of Particular Places or Areas in Michigan	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Alpena	11	$ 1,530	0	$ 0	9	$ 920
Battle Creek	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bay City	45	2,330	0	0	10	600
Benton Harbor	15	1,450	0	0	0	0
Flint	0	0	0	0	96	9,471
Gogebic	14	1,374	0	0	6	463
Grand Rapids	8	730	0	0	30	2,970
Henry Ford	1	250	0	0	26	3,380
Highland Park	0	0	0	0	6	1,200
Jackson	0	0	0	0	36	5,370
Muskegon	21	3,250	0	0	1	150
Northwestern	32	3,890	0	0	10	1,000
Port Huron	5	500	0	0	6	600
South Macomb	0	0	5	600	5	300
Totals	152	$15,304	5	$600	241	$26,424

Note: No funds designated for foreign students only, non-residents of Michigan only, and residents of particular places or areas outside of Michigan.

Table 23. Number and Amount of Scholarships Awarded Having Time Limitation on Holding of the Awards during 1956-57.

Time Limitation	State-controlled Institutions			Privately Controlled Institutions			Community Colleges		
	Number	Amount	% of Total No.	Number	Amount	% of Total no.	Number	Amount	% of Total no.
One year only	3,888	$1,240,424	35.7	709	$158,523	39.0	172	$19,895	43.2
Renewable for one or more additional years	6,990	1,388,209	64.3	1,107	249,153	61.0	226	23,432	56.8
Totals	10,878	$2,628,633	100.0	1,816	$407,676	100.0	398	$43,327	100.0

graduation. No such stipulations were reported for any of the State-controlled institutions or community colleges. No institutions reported repayment clauses requiring repayment upon graduation from the institution.

Unused Scholarships

From time to time, public attention is called to the alleged fact that large amounts of scholarship funds are idle each year because of overly-restrictive clauses and requirements. In all the institutions reporting for this study, only 26 individual scholarships were identified as having restrictive clauses making them difficult to administer. The total dollar-value of these scholarships was $22,250, of which $12,800 was reported by the State-controlled institutions. Even though this amount is relatively small, less than one per cent of the total amount of scholarships granted during the year, the institutions in which these scholarship funds are vested might well seek ways of modifying the requirements, through mutual agreement with donors, where possible, so that the funds could be used each year. In any case, the data of this study indicate that, for the State of Michigan, the claim of large sums of unused scholarship funds is exaggerated.

Restrictions Related to Academic Objective of Recipient

Numerous scholarships contain restrictions which specify the awarding of the grant to individuals pursuing college work in particular areas of study or for particular professional objectives. Table 24 summarizes the results of the responses to this question by the reporting institutions. The great majority of scholarships bear no restriction relating to the academic objective of the recipient. Certain subject areas, however, have been identified in substantial numbers of scholarships. In the State-controlled institutions, the largest concentration is for those individuals preparing for the teaching profession, with

Table 24. Number and Amount of Scholarships Awarded during 1956-57 Having Restrictions Related to the Academic Field of the Recipient's Preparation.

Academic Field	State-controlled			Privately Controlled			Community Colleges		
	Number	Amount	% of Amount	Number	Amount	% of Amount	Number	Amount	% of Amount
Liberal Arts	6	$ 755	(1)	187	$ 31,299	7.6	0	$ 0	
Agriculture	226	35,584	1.3	0	0	0.0	0	0	
Engineering	152	64,016	2.4	87	34,210	8.3	0	0	
Home Economics	21	4,386	0.2	1	400	0.1	0	0	
Law	1	200	(1)	0	0	0.0	1	150	0.3
Librarianship	1	85	(1)	6	1,950	0.5	0	0	
Medicine	4	650	(1)	1	200	(1)	0	0	
Nursing	16	7,550	0.3	21	6,630	1.6	0	0	
Pharmacy	14	1,410	0.1	0	0	0.0	0	0	
Social Work	0	0	0.0	2	500	0.1	0	0	
Teaching	2,649	237,981	8.9	3	1,470	0.4	37	3,960	9.2
Theology	0	0	0.0	56	10,007	2.4	0	0	
Other*	104	59,257	2.2	33	28,260	6.9	27	3,455	8.0
No Restriction	8,230	2,261,595	84.6	1,416	297,034	72.1	333	35,572	82.5

* Other includes mathematics, science, business, music, chemistry, visual arts, architecture, commerce and finance, paper technology, occupational therapy, accounting, retailing, mechanical technology, foreign languages, secretarial, journalism, forest products, hotel and restaurant management, food distribution, and mineral industries.

(1) Less than 0.05%.

lesser numbers in the areas of engineering and agriculture. In the privately controlled institutions, engineering, liberal arts, and theology are the only areas for which a fairly large number of scholarships are designated. In the community colleges, the area of teaching is the only one for which a significant percentage of specific designations are made.

In addition to restrictions related to occupational or academic objectives, certain scholarships are awarded on the basis of the applicant's ability in one of several areas such as music, art, debating, etc. In the State-controlled institutions, only 5.7 per cent of the grants were made for these specific abilities. In the privately controlled institutions, this group constituted only 2.1 per cent of all scholarship grants, while in the community colleges only one such scholarship was reported (Table 25).

Information was requested regarding the number and amounts of grants made to applicants on the basis of athletic ability. The data, such as were received, were not analyzed and are not reported, because of differing policies followed by the institutions in administering and reporting such awards. In some institutions these funds, the major portion of which (in many cases, the entire fund) is derived from the income from athletic activities (gate receipts), are administered by the department of athletics. In other institutions, some or all of the amounts awarded are administered through the usual scholarship committee channels. Because of the lack of data from some institutions and the inconsistency or lack of uniformity of those data received, no summaries or analyses were made of financial grants to students on the basis of athletic ability.

Table 25. Number and Amount of Schclarships Awarded Having Restrictions Related to Special Abilities of the Recipient during 1956-57.

Type of Institution	No Restrictions		Art Ability		Debating Ability		Journalistic Ability		Extra-Curricular Activity		Musical Ability		Other*	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
State-controlled	10,465	$2,497,522	2	$ 220	9	$1,314	9	$1,664	246	$24,959	171	$20,517	198	$23,220
Privately controlled	1,752	385,969	11	7,820	2	200	0	0	1	100	24	3,330	0	0
Community colleges	386	41,987	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100
Totals	12,603	$1,424,288	13	$8,040	11	$1,514	9	$1,664	247	$25,059	195	$23,847	199	$23,320
Percentage of total number	91.3		0.1		0.1		0.1		3.2		2.6		2.6	

* Includes Leadership, Member of Future Farmers of America Club, Member of 4-H Club, Member of Future Homemakers of America, Member of Jr. Engr. Training (JET) Club.

CHAPTER III

STUDENT LOANS

The present chapter of this study is concerned with the student loan funds available at the various institutions of higher education in the State. There is a distinct difference between funds designated as student loans and those designated as scholarships or fellowships. As was indicated earlier, scholarships and fellowships carry no requirement of repayment, except in a very few unusual cases such as were cited in the discussion in the previous chapter. Loans, on the other hand, carry clearly stated clauses of repayment, and, in most cases, interest is also charged.

The inquiry form sent to each Michigan institution requested data on any and all student loan funds belonging to the institution. No request was made for information about loan funds belonging to other organizations that might provide loans for students attending the institution. There is a considerable volume of student loan funds belonging to and administered by non-institutional organizations such as service clubs, fraternal orders, and church groups. It was believed, however, that many of the institutions would not be able to furnish information about such non-institutional loan funds, so no request was made for information about them. If it had been possible to collect data about such funds, their addition to the statistics reported in this study would doubtless have increased substantially the amounts reported as available for student loans to those attending institutions of higher education in Michigan.

The present study is limited, in the main, to an analysis of the student loan funds, the condition of the funds, and the extent of their use in the Michigan institutions in 1956-57. It would have been interesting to study the characteristics and limitations of the student loan funds, such as the rates of interest charged, the maximum amount that may be loaned to one student, the conditions of repayment, and the agencies within the institutions charged with responsibility for administering the loans, but the time available for the study did not permit an inquiry into such matters.

It is important to note that the funds used for student loans in Michigan are all originally derived from private sources. Even in the publicly controlled institutions funds from State or local governmental sources have not been used to create loan funds. This situation is somewhat in contrast to that noted in the previous chapter, where it was pointed out that some governmental funds are used for scholarships and fellowships.

Capital of Student Loan Funds during 1956-57

Inquiry was made regarding the total assets of the loan funds at the beginning of the 1956-57 fiscal year, the total assets at the end of that fiscal year, loans written off as uncollectible, sources from which additions were made to the loan funds, and the average capital of loan funds available per full-time-equivalent student.

Table 26 shows that the total assets of loan funds at the beginning of the 1956-57 fiscal year as reported by the participating institutions were $1,760,373. Fourteen per cent of this amount was reported by the privately controlled institutions, 85 per cent by the State-controlled institutions, and less than one-third of one per cent by the community colleges. The total assets at the end of the 1956-57 fiscal year were $1,929,074 for all institutions combined, an increase of about 10 per cent during the year. The privately controlled institutions reported an increase of about 5 per cent while the State-controlled institutions reported approximately 12 per cent increase in student loan fund capital during the year.

Table 26. Capital of Student Loan Funds during 1956-57 for the Three Types of Institutions in Michigan.

Type of Institution	Total Assets at Beginning of 1956-57 Fiscal Year	Capital of Loan Funds Available per F.T.E. Student at Beginning of Year	Uncollectible Loans Written Off	Additions to Loan Fund during 1956-1957			Total Assets at End of 1956-57 Fiscal Year
				Gifts	Earnings	Other	
State-controlled	$1,512,495	$21.95	$7,892	$112,233	$41,096	$32,455	$1,667,364
Privately controlled	242,347	10.28	84	5,822	1,868	0	248,055
Community colleges	5,531	0.51	20	140	0	0	5,655
Totals	$1,760,373	$17.03	$7,996	$118,195	$42,964	$32,455	$1,921,074

The three types of institutions varied noticeably in average amount of loan funds available per full-time-equivalent student at the beginning of the year 1956-57. In the State-controlled institutions this figure is $21.95; in the private institutions it is $10.28, less than half as much as in the State-controlled institutions. The average is only $0.51 in the community colleges. The average per full-time-equivalent student for all three types of institutions is $17.03. The data point strongly to a probable need for much larger student loan funds in the privately controlled institutions.

The Bulletin of the U. S. Office of Education on Financial Aid to College Students: Undergraduate,[1] to which reference has previously been made, reports data showing that in 1955-56 Michigan ranked sixth among the States in the amount of student loan funds available, and third in the total number of students receiving loans. In the fall of 1955 Michigan ranked seventh among the States in total college enrollments. These data indicate that, as compared with other States, Michigan stands a little better than might be expected, on the basis of number of students to be served, with reference both to the amount of loan funds available and to their use by students.

An interesting fact is brought out in Table 26 regarding the dependability of repayment on the part of those students receiving the loans. During the 1956-57 fiscal year, a total of only $7,996 was written off as uncollectible loans in all the institutions reporting. The uncollectible notes written off amounted to about one-half of one per cent of the total loan fund capital in the State-controlled institutions, and to an even smaller percentage in the community colleges and the privately controlled institutions. This record of loan collection and repayment is remarkably good. It may be presumed that the institutional auditors have been diligent and conservative in writing off loans that are probably uncollectible, so one must conclude that the risks involved in lending to students through institutional loan funds have been relatively small. This observation is corroborated by similar experience in institutions all over the country.

The fact must not be overlooked that the wise and careful management of the loan funds by the officials of the institutions undoubtedly accounts for a large portion of the high degree of success in administering the student loan funds.

---

[1] Theresa Birch Wilkins, Financial Aid for College Students: Undergraduate. U. S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Bulletin 1957, No. 18, p. 2.

At the same time, the funds have rendered excellent and extensive service to the students attending institutions of higher education in Michigan. The officials of the institutions deserve commendation for the manner in which the student loan funds have been administered.

Tables 27, 28, and 29 show, respectively for the State-controlled institutions, the privately controlled, and the community colleges, the basic facts about the loan fund capital in each institution during 1956-57. It will be noted that the Branch of Michigan College of Mining and Technology at Sault Ste. Marie has no loan funds. Six of the community colleges do not have loan funds, and eleven of the privately controlled institutions reported they have no student loan funds. Most institutions of higher education have found that student loan funds render a great service to students. It is suggested that institutions not having such funds give consideration to the desirability of developing this source of financial assistance to their students.

Loans Made and Collected during 1956-57

Tables 30 and 31 summarize the loan fund transactions during 1956-57 and the condition of loan funds at the end of the fiscal year, 1956-57. During the 1956-57 year, 12,670 loans were made in all the reporting institutions. Ninety-one per cent of these loans were made in the State-controlled institutions. Of the total assets reported, $1,760,373, by all the institutions (see Table 26), loans made during the year totaled $1,408,806 which was equal to 80 per cent of the total loan fund capital. In other words, at least 20 per cent of the available loan funds were not used during the year. Inasmuch as there was, undoubtedly, considerable turnover in the loan funds during the year, because of short-term loans made and repaid within the year, it is entirely probable that at any given time during the year much more than 20 per cent of the total loan fund capital was not in use for student loans.

Table 27. **Student Loan Fund Capital during 1956-57 in the State-controlled Institutions.**

Institution	Total Assets at Beginning of 1956-57 Fiscal Year	Available Loans per F.T.E. Student at Beginning of 1956-57 Fiscal Year	Uncollectible Loans Written Off	Additions to Loan Fund during 1956-57			Total Asset at End of 1956-57 Fiscal Year
				Gifts	Earnings	Other	
Central Mich. Col.	$ 33,220	$10.32	$ 0	$ 268	$ 4,589	$ 0	$ 38,077
Eastern Mich. Col.	61,494	17.57	0	215	3,106	0	64,285
Ferris Institute	28,985	19.18	10	1,110	518	0	30,603
Mich. Col. of M&T (H)	69,295	32.23	0	3,797	1,116	0	74,208
Mich. Col. of M&T (S)	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0
Michigan State Univ.	237,298	13.34	4,165	24,776	4,038	0	254,448
Northern Mich. Col.	15,232	14.29	0	0	91	2,798	15,052
Univ. of Michigan	971,323	46.36	3,632	76,607	27,026	29,640	1,039,299
Wayne State University	74,430	5.90	0	4,810	5	0	79,238
Western Mich. Univ.	21,218	3.71	85	650	607	17	22,154
Totals	$1,512,495	$21.95	$7,892	$112,233	$41,096	$32,455	$1,667,364

Table 28. Student Loan Fund Capital during 1956-57 in the Privately Controlled Institutions.

Institution	Total Assets at Beginning of 1956-57 Fiscal Year	Available Loans per F.T.E. Student at Beginning of 1956-57 Fiscal Year	Additions to Loan Fund during 1956-57		Total Assets at End of 1956-57 Fiscal Year
			Gifts	Earnings	
P-77	$100,000	$36.01	$ 0	$ 0	$100,000
P-70*	62,991	8.96	3,050	1,379	66,808
P-88	16,220	56.22	0	0	16,220
P-68	10,989	6.02	200	255	11,444
P-12	10,985	8.62	0	0	10,817
P-17	6,730	3.94	250	0	6,980
P-41	6,500	15.85	393	5	6,545
P-18	6,019	33.44	200	190	6,409
P-11	6,000	52.86	0	0	6,000
P-33	4,373	13.18	0	4	4,377
P-78	2,681	3.42	50	0	2,731
P-30	2,387	23.17	742	24	2,464
P-95	2,008	2.02	0	0	2,008
P-38	1,833	4.74	650	0	2,333
P-79	1,338	1.13	287	11	1,626
P-37	1,227	8.94	0	0	1,227
P-50	66	0.44	0	0	66
Totals	$242,347	$10.28	$5,822	$1,868	$248,055

* This institution reported $84.00 written off as uncollectible.

Note: Loans available, although no specific figures were reported for P-72, P-24, and P-53.

P-60, P-42, P-64, P-84, P-16, P-83, P-44, P-13, P-19, P-10, and P-58 reported no loan funds available.

Table 29. Student Loan Fund Capital during 1956-57 in the Community Colleges.

Institution	Total Assets at Beginning of 1956-57 Fiscal Year	Available Loans per F.T.E. Student at Beginning of 1956-57 Fiscal Year	Uncollectible Loans Written Off	Additions to Loan Fund (Gifts) during 1956-57	Total Assets at End of 1956-57 Fiscal Year
Alpena	$ 100	$ .60	$20	$100	$ 180
Flint	1,294	.58	0	0	1,294
Gogebic	301	2.84	0	0	301
Grand Rapids	679	.56	0	0	679
Henry Ford	1,839	.90	0	0	1,839
Jackson	500	.92	0	0	500
Northwestern	544	1.79	0	40	584
Port Huron	274	.51	0	0	274
Totals	$5,531	$ .51	$20	$140	$5,651

Note: Battle Creek, Bay City, Benton Harbor, Highland Park, Muskegon, and South Macomb reported no loan funds available.

Table 30. Loan Fund Transactions during 1956-57 in the Three Types of Institutions in Michigan.

Type of Institution	Number of Loans Made	Amount Loaned	Average Amount of Loans	Total Collections of Principal of Loans	Total Interest Collected on Student Loans
State-controlled	11,600	$1,323,931	$114.13	$1,030,788	$13,067
Privately controlled	721	78,173	108.42	52,359	1,208
Community colleges	349	6,702	19.20	5,925	0
Totals	12,670	$1,408,806	$111.19	$1,089,072	$14,275

Table 31. Condition of Loan Funds in the Three Types of Institutions in Michigan at end of Fiscal Year, 1956-57.

Type of Institution	Amount in Student Notes at End of 1956-57 Fiscal Year	Amount Unloaned at End of Fiscal Year, 1956-57		Total Loans More than Two Years Old, End of 1956-57	
		Amount	Per Cent of Total Assets Unloaned	Amount	Per Cent of Total Assets in Old Notes
State-controlled	$913,157	$754,207	45.2	$24,742	1.5
Privately controlled	130,842	118,183	47.6	16,927	6.8
Community colleges	865	4,790	84.7	113	2.0
Totals	$1,044,864	$877,180	45.7	$41,782	2.2

Table 30 shows that the average size of loan was $111.19. The average size of loan is about the same in both the State-controlled and the privately controlled institutions. In the community colleges the average size of loan is less than one-fifth as large as in either of the other two groups of institutions. It seems clear that the general practice in the community colleges is to use the loan funds only for meeting the relatively minor, short-term emergencies of students.

The total amount loaned during 1956-57 was substantially larger than the collections made on the principal of loans. This indicates that during the year there was an increasing demand for financial assistance in the form of loans that ran beyond the end of the fiscal year. This is a significant trend, for if it continues some of the institutions will undoubtedly need more loan fund capital than they had in 1956-57.

Interest collected on student loans in 1956-57 amounted to a total of $14,275. This is only a little more than one per cent of the amount loaned during the year, and is almost double the amount of old loans written off as uncollectible (Table 26).

Table 31 shows that almost half the total amount of student loan funds were not in use for student loans at the end of the fiscal year. The percentage is similar in the State-controlled and the privately controlled institutions, but the community colleges had only a very small percentage of their loan funds that were in use at the end of the fiscal year. It is to be expected that many of the short-term loans made during the year will have been repaid by the end of the fiscal year. One might conclude from the data of Table 31 that the institutions, in general, had adequate funds in 1956-57 to meet the needs of their students for long term loans. It should be understood that the general practice is to keep unused student loan funds productive by investing them to produce some income when they are not needed to meet the needs of students for loans.

The amount of student loans more than two years outstanding is shown in Table 31 to be $41,782. The percentage of total student loan fund assets in loans more than two years old is relatively low in both the State-controlled institutions and the community colleges, but the percentage is much larger in the privately controlled institutions. This probably reflects some difference in policy among the institutions with respect to the long-term financing of students by means of loans.

Table 32 summarizes the condition of the loan funds at each of the State-controlled institutions in Michigan. Similar data are shown in Table 33 for each of the privately controlled institutions reporting, and in Table 34 for each of the Michigan community colleges.

A comparison of the data of Tables 32 and 27 shows that Michigan State University reported total loans during the year more than twice as large as the capital amount of the available loan funds. This is a result of the high turn-over in loan fund capital used for short-term loans. That is, at Michigan State University the same money is used several times during the year on a short-term basis. Table 32 shows that at most of the State-controlled institutions the unloaned capital of student loan funds was about as large, or in some cases much larger, than the amount of capital in student loan notes. Michigan State University and Wayne State University were the only institutions in which the unloaned capital was relatively small in comparison with the amounts in student notes at the end of the fiscal year.

On the basis of these data, one may conclude that during 1956-57 the State-controlled institutions had adequate loan funds available. Informal reports from several of the institutions would indicate, however, that the present economic trend and last year's increase in tuition at several of the State institutions have resulted in a sharp increase in requests for student loans since the year to which the data of this study relate.

Table 32. Condition of Loan Funds during 1956-57 in the State-controlled Institutions in Michigan.

Institution	Number of Loans Made during 1956-57	Amount Loaned during 1956-57	Amount in Student Notes at End of Fiscal Year 1956-57	Amount Un-loaned at End of Fiscal Year 1956-57	Total Collection of Principal of Loans during 1956-57	Total Interest Collected on Student Loans during 1956-57	Loans More Than Two Years Old	
							Total Amount	Per Cent of Loan Fund Assets
Central Mich. Col.	146	$ 20,698	$ 22,322	$ 15,755	$ 24,170	$ 1,000	$ 0	0.0
Eastern Mich. Col.	403	45,943	16,657	47,628	40,793	879	67	0.1
Ferris Institute	197	9,132	6,958	23,645	7,131	40	1,706	5.9
Mich. Col. of M&T (H)	234	38,474	38,634	35,574	26,404	364	5,288	7.6
Mich. Col. of M&T (S)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Michigan State Univ.	4,632	484,950	182,749	71,699	456,097	653	1,344	0.6
Northern Mich. Col.	136	9,353	8,388	6,664	4,443	48	1,505	9.9
Univ. of Michigan	4,959	646,291	577,699	511,600	427,647	9,471	8,438	0.9
Wayne State Univ.	585	47,190	50,977	28,261	23,016	5	5,537	7.4
Western Mich. Univ.	308	21,900	8,773	13,381	21,087	607	857	4.0
Totals	11,600	$1,323,931	$913,157	$754,207	$1,030,788	$13,067	$24,742	1.5

Table 33. Condition of Loan Funds during 1956-57 in the Privately Controlled Institutions in Michigan.

Institution	No. of Loans Made during 1956-57	Amount Loaned during 1956-57	Amount in Student Notes at End of Fiscal Yr. 1956-57	Amount Unloaned at end of 1956-57 Fiscal Yr.	Total Collection of Principal of Loans during 1956-57	Total Interest Collected on Student Loans during 1956-57	Loans More Than Two Years Old	
							Total Amount	Per cent of Loan Fund Assets
P-70	304	$16,693	$ 15,021	$ 51,787	$15,691	$ 433	$ 6,180	9.8
P-77	119	36,341	73,509	26,491	24,186	547	2,425	2.4
P-68	100	7,500	7,678	3,766	0	0	0	0.0
P-18	78	4,210	925	5,484	3,984	152	86	1.4
P-17	56	5,516	3,254	3,726	2,262	0	30	0.4
P-41	39	2,778	1,558	4,988	1,516	5	0	0.0
P-11	9	1,163	4,603	1,397	1,165	0	3,235	53.9
P-33	4	586	2,541	1,836	815	4	1,955	44.7
P-53*	4	360	970	Not reported	260	0	870	-
P-79	3	250	45	1,581	205	11	0	0.0
P-78	2	418	743	1,988	360	0	0	0.0
P-38	1	150	1,599	734	0	0	1,449	79.1
P-95	1	1,800	1,384	624	1,194	49	350	17.4
P-50	0	0	0	66	0	0	0	0.0
P-88	0	0	16,220	0	0	0	0	0.0
P-37	0	0	0	1,227	0	0	0	0.0
P-30	0	0	247	2,216	14	6	247	10.3
P-12	1	408	545	10,272	707	1	100	0.9
Totals	721	$78,173	$130,842	$118,183	$52,359	$1,208	$16,927	6.6(1)

* Loans available, but not through a regular student loan fund.

(1) Not including P-53.

Note: Loans available, although no specific figures reported for P-72 and P-24.

Table 34. Condition of Loan Funds during 1956-57 in the Community Colleges in Michigan.

Institution	Number of Loans Made during 1956-57	Amount Loaned during 1956-57	Amount in Student Notes at End of Fiscal Year 1956-57	Amount Un-loaned at End of Fiscal Year 1956-57	Total Collection of Principal of Loans during 1956-57	Total Interest Collected on Student Loans during 1956-57	Loans More than Two Years Old	
							Total Amount	Per Cent of Loan Fund Assets
Alpena	4	$ 82	$ 8	$ 172	$ 74	0	$ 0	0.0
Battle Creek	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Bay City	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Benton Harbor	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Flint	24	1,040	384	910	656	0	0	0.0
Gogebic	0	0	0	301	0	0	0	0.0
Grand Rapids	24	1,349	367	312	1,120	0	113	16.6
Henry Ford	234	1,799	0	1,839	1,799	0	0	0.0
Highland Park	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Jackson	17	657	106	394	501	0	0	0.0
Muskegon	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Northwestern	46	1,775	0	588	1,775	0	0	0.0
Port Huron	0	0	0	274	0	0	0	0.0
South Macomb	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Totals	349	$6,702	$865	$4,790	$5,925	0	$113	2.0

For the privately controlled institutions (Table 33), the total loaned, $78,173, was approximately 30 per cent of the total available. Thus, in these institutions, more than two-thirds of the loan funds remained idle during the year. It is probably for this reason that the private institutions have not made any particular effort to increase their loan fund assets.

In the community colleges (Table 34) of the State, the total amount loaned out during the year was actually greater than the reported assets. In other words, one might conclude that the community colleges should strive to increase their loan funds to make such assistance more readily available to their students.

Terms of Student Loans

Table 35 summarizes information regarding the length of term of student loans at the three types of institutions. In each of the groups of institutions, the largest number of loans are made on the basis of repayment within the year in which made. For all the institutions, 68.4 per cent of the loans were made with the expectation of repayment in full within the year in which they were made, 21.1 per cent were made with the expectation that they would be paid in full within six months after the end of the year in which they were made, and 10.5 per cent were made with the expectation that repayment would extend more than six months beyond the year in which the loan was made.

Two final observations should be made regarding the administration of loan funds and their availability to students. First, it is rather evident that most of the State-controlled institutions do a careful job of administering their loan funds. Their records appear to be available and quite complete. In some of the privately controlled institutions, on the contrary, the records are either unavailable or poorly kept. The second observation is that there are several privately controlled institutions which do not have any loan funds at all. These privately controlled institutions, as well as several of the community colleges, might increase their service to students by securing capital to be used as a loan fund.

Table 35. Length of Term of Student Loans in the Three Types of Institutions in Michigan during 1956-57.

Type of Institution	Expected to be Repaid in Full Within Year in which Made			Expected to be Repaid in Full Within Six Months After End of Year in which Made			Expected that Repayments will Extend More than Six Months After End of Year in which Loan was Made		
	Number	Per cent of Total Number	Amount	Number	Per Cent of Total Number	Amount	Number	Per cent of Total Number	Amount
State-controlled	7,770	67.8	$678,564	2,587	22.6	$368,682	1,104	9.6	$275,226
Privately controlled	530	71.9	31,035	11	1.5	1,689	196	26.6	59,874
Community colleges	276	82.4	3,631	49	14.6	1,981	10	3.0	384
Totals	8,576	68.4	$713,230	2,647	21.1	$372,352	1,310	10.5	$335,484

CHAPTER IV

STUDENT EMPLOYMENT BY THE INSTITUTIONS

The third type of financial assistance to students, typically available on most college and university campuses is student employment. As was indicated previously, employment opportunities on and near a college or university campus are numerous and varied. Not only is there opportunity for employment on the campus itself, but the students constitute a very desirable labor supply for local business firms and industry.

In the present study, consideration is given only to such employment as is under the administrative jurisdiction of the college or university which the student is attending. The decision to limit the study in this way was not reached because the amount of non-institutionally administered employment was considered to be small or negligible. On the contrary, in some of the institutions, jobs "in town" constitute a very large percentage of the employment of students. The "off campus" jobs are omitted from consideration here because of the difficulty of obtaining sufficient information regarding such employment of students. Institutions, typically, do not keep detailed personnel records showing the employment of their students in off-campus jobs.

An institution of higher education should maintain rather complete employment records on its students. A central record of all employment of each student during a term or semester is necessary in order to control the total time a student devotes to his outside job or jobs. A student with a mediocre academic potential may run into difficulty in maintaining satisfactory progress in his courses if he undertakes employment utilizing too much of his non-class time. The record should also show all campus employment that may be related to the future professional objectives of the student. An effective student personnel service in a college or university will maintain, as a part of each student's personnel file, a complete record of all his employment experience. Such a record is of great assistance in answering inquiries about the student and in facilitating the placement service. Furthermore, the student personnel services should be organized to assist students in finding needed part-time employment both on and off the campus.

Oftentimes employment may be arranged in such a way that it supplements effectively the student's academic objective and gives him a kind of learning experience that has value in the curriculum he is pursuing. One such formal program is the cooperative work-study plan in operation in a number of institutions throughout the Nation, particularly in the areas of engineering and business administration. The University of Detroit is the only Michigan institution currently operating such a plan. There are plans for inaugurating this type of work-study arrangement at the newly approved branch of the University of Michigan in Dearborn and at the branch of Michigan State University in Oakland County.

The nature of the work-study plan at the University of Detroit is typical of most such programs. During their freshman and sophomore years, the students are in regular attendance at the institution. When they attain junior status, they are divided into two groups. While one group is attending classes, the students of the other group are working at a training assignment in industry. At the end of a given period, the two groups exchange places. It should be emphasized that the training assignments are made with the student's specific professional objective in mind. There is institutional supervision and coordination, and the student is normally required to submit a written report on his work assignment as well as receiving an evaluation by his direct supervisor on the job.

It is possible to distinguish at least two kinds of on-campus employment available to students. First there is the typical job in the operation and maintenance of the physical plant, or in dining halls and student unions, and similar units of the institution. These jobs are mostly in the unskilled labor category and require no previous experience or qualifications for satisfactory performance. The second kind of job is one which is awarded on the basis of the specialized academic competence of the student and is generally limited to advanced undergraduates or graduate students. This second kind of employment is often awarded as sort of an honor, under conditions similar to the award of a scholarship or fellowship except that service is required in return for the stipend the student receives. The work done may involve some actual teaching or assistance to a faculty member or department as paper reader, research assistant, or laboratory assistant.

The information schedule on which the Michigan institutions were asked to report the on-campus employment of their students requested information on each of the two different types of employment. Separate information was requested for undergraduate and graduate students on the type of employment based on specialized academic competence. The data on student employment in each of these categories are summarized for each of the three groups of Michigan institutions in Table 36.

Unfortunately, not all the institutions participating in the study could furnish complete data on the employment of students in their institutions. Eastern Michigan College could provide no data except on the special awards given graduate

Table 36. Number of Students Employed and Compensation Paid Them in the Three Types of Michigan Institutions during 1956-57

	State-controlled Institutions		Privately Controlled Institutions		Community Colleges		Total, All Institutions Combined	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Students given general employment by the institution	15,381 (11,607)*	$2,683,318*	2,219	$438,944#	145	$ 31,771	17,745	$3,154,033*#
Undergraduates receiving special award requiring service to institutions	98	16,237	196	30,695	183	13,892	477	60,824
Graduate students receiving special awards requiring service	710	611,483	67	75,650	0	0	777	687,133
Total, all types of student employment	16,189 (12,415)*	$3,311,038*	2,482 (2,462)&	$545,289# (542,833)&	328 (266)@	$45,663@	18,999 (15,144)*&@	$3,901,990 ($3,899,534)*&@
Average compensation per full-time-equivalent student		$74.47*		$25.23#		$ 8.07@		$54.40*#@
Average compensation per student employed		266.70*		220.48&		171.02@		257.50*&@
Percentage of full-time-equivalent students employed	24.75		11.37		3.98		19.36	

* Does not include Eastern Michigan College and the University of Michigan.
# Does not include privately controlled institutions P-12, P-24, P-38, and P-64.
& Does not include privately controlled institutions P-12, P-24, P-38, P-64, and P-83.
@ Does not include Henry Ford Community College and Port Huron Junior College.

students for service in the College. The University of Michigan could report the number of students employed in the institution but not the total amount paid them. Four community colleges (Benton Harbor Community College and Technical Institute, Highland Park Junior College, Muskegon Community College, and South Macomb Community College) reported that they employed no students. Two others, Henry Ford Community College and Port Huron Junior College, could report the number of students they employed but not the compensation paid them. Four privately controlled colleges reported no students employed, three others could report no information on their employment of students, one other could report the number employed but not the amount of compensation paid them, and still another could report the amount of compensation paid students but not the number who were employed. These omissions in the data are indicated by footnotes in the tabulations.

The number of students reported in Table 36 as having been employed by the participating institutions was 18,999, of which number 16,189 were employed in State-controlled institutions, 2,482 in the privately controlled institutions, and 328 in the community colleges. These figures represent 24.75 per cent of the full-time-equivalent students enrolled in the State-controlled institutions, 11.37 per cent of the full-time-equivalent students enrolled in the privately controlled institutions, and 3.98 per cent of the full-time-equivalent students enrolled in community colleges. Although only a relatively small percentage of the students enrolled in community colleges is employed by the institution they attend, in all probability there are just as many working students, proportionately, in these institutions as in the other two types, except that their employment is in local establishments other than the college.

The Bulletin of the U. S. Office of Education on Financial Aid to College Students: Undergraduates,[1] to which reference has been made in earlier chapters, reports data showing that in 1955-56 Michigan ranked fourth among the States in the total amount of earnings by students employed by the institutions, and second in the number of students employed. In the fall term of 1955 Michigan ranked seventh among the States in total college enrollments. The data make it clear that the institutions of higher education in Michigan, as compared to those in other States, provide a larger total amount of compensation for students employed and employ a larger number of students, than would be expected from the number of students enrolled.

The detailed data about the extent of each kind of student employment in the individual institutions of each of the three types will be found in Tables 37, 38, and 39. The extensiveness of the institutional programs of student employment varies greatly. In the publicly controlled institutions the low is at Michigan College of Mining and Technology (Houghton) where the number of students employed is only 5 per cent of the full-time-equivalent enrollment, while the number employed at Michigan State University is 45 per cent of the full-time-equivalent enrollment. The range in the privately controlled institutions is from one per cent or less of the full-time-equivalent enrollment in three colleges to more than 90 per cent in two others. The ratio of employed students to full-time-equivalent enrollment is uniformly low in the community colleges, the highest ratio being at Gogebic Community College and the lowest at Bay City Junior College.

The size of the city in which the institution is located probably has much to do with the percentage of students employed by the institution. The large cities provide more opportunities for off-campus jobs and thus reduce the necessity for

---

[1] Theresa Birch Wilkins, Financial Aid for College Students: Undergraduate. U. S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Bulletin 1957, No. 18, p. 2.

Table 37. Number of Students Employed and the Amounts of Compensation Paid Them in the State-controlled Institutions during 1956-57.

Institution	Undergraduates Receiving Awards That Required Some Service to the Institution		Graduate Students Receiving Awards That Required Some Service to the Institution		Other Students Given Employment by Institution		Total Number of Students Employed	Percentage of Full-time equivalent Students Employed
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount		
Central Mich. College	0	$ 0	0	$ 0	1,291	$168,422	1,291	40.11
Eastern Mich. College	0	0	(7)*	(1,665)*	not reported			
Ferris Institute	0	0	0	0	215	80,522	215	14.23
Michigan College of M&T (Houghton)	0	0	3	4,600	108	36,195	111	5.16
Michigan College of M&T (Sault)	0	0	0	0	129	14,997	129	33.95
Michigan State University	0	0	583	293,883	7,497	1,500,918	8,080	45.43
Northern Mich. College	24	6,039	0	0	394	56,135	418	39.21
University of Michigan	0	0	0	0	3,774	not rptd.	3,774	18.01
Wayne State University	0	0	112	304,000	900	548,000	1,012	8.02
Western Mich. University	74	10,198	12	9,000	1,073	278,129	1,159	20.24
Totals	98	$16,237	710*	$611,483*	15,381 (11,607)&	$2,683,318&	16,189#	24.75#

* Not included in totals.

# Not including Eastern Michigan College.

& Excluding University of Michigan and Eastern Michigan College.

Table 38. Number of Students Employed and the Amounts of Compensation Paid Them in the Privately Controlled Institutions during 1956-57.

Institution	Amount Paid Undergraduates Receiving Awards That Required Some Service to the Institution	Amount Paid Graduate Students Receiving Awards That Required Some Service to the Institution	Amount Paid Other Students Given Employment by Institution, not-Considered an "Award"	Percentage of Full-time-equivalent Students Employed
P-70	$ 8,523	$75,650	$160,983	9.20
P-17	0	0	50,800	22.57
P-95	0	0	48,039	22.61
P-77	0	0	36,186	14.58
P-68	0	0	30,000	14.58
P-33	0	0	20,000	41.89
P-72	0	0	15,050	5.39
P-88	0	0	14,903	21.84
P-37	0	0	14,181	91.07
P-16	0	0	12,187	0.87
P-13	4,785	0	10,392	60.58
P-11	0	0	9,260	19.38
P-78	0	0	7,668	8.54
P-53	0	0	3,424	91.32
P-84	0	0	2,515	5.43
P-83	0	0	2,456	Not rptd.
P-30	0	0	900	14.56
P-58	7,200	0	0	7.86
P-10	1,500	0	0	5.41
P-44	1,035	0	0	2.68
P-38	0	0	Not reported	5.17
P-50	1,750	0	0	1.33
P-79	5,902	0	0	1.44
P-41	0	0	Not reported	0.24
Totals	$30,695	$75,650	$438,944	11.37*

* Number of full-time-equivalent students enrolled does not include enrollments at P-83.

Note: No information on students employment submitted by institutions P-12, P-24, and P-64.

Institutions reporting no students employed include P-18, P-19, P-42, and P-60.

Table 39. Number of Students Employed and the Amounts of Compensation Paid Them in the Community Colleges during 1956-57.

Institution	Undergraduates Receiving Awards That Required Some Service to the Institution		Other Students Given Employment by Institution, Not Considered an "Award"		Total Number of Students Employed	Percentage of Full-time-equivalent Students Employed
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount		
Alpena	0	$ 0	10	$ 945	10	5.98
Battle Creek	0	0	5	889	5	5.49
Bay City	5	380	6	1,160	11	1.12
Flint	60	4,500	18	22,400	78	3.47
Gogebic	0	0	12	557	12	11.33
Grand Rapids	118	9,012	0	0	118	9.71
Henry Ford	0	0	36	Not reptd.	36	1.77
Jackson	0	0	21	2,840	21	3.86
Northwestern	0	0	12	2,980	12	3.95
Port Huron	0	0	25	Not reptd.	25	4.64
Totals*	183	$13,892	145	$31,771	328 (267)#	3.98

* No students reported as employed by Benton Harbor, Highland Park Junior College, Muskegon Community College, and South Macomb Community College.

# Excluding Henry Ford Community College and Port Huron Junior College.

provision of employment by the institutions. This situation probably accounts for the employment of over 8,000 students at Michigan State University, as compared to about 1,000 at Wayne State University.

Note was previously made that Eastern Michigan College reported as "not available" the numbers of students employed by the institution and the amount of compensation paid them. As was pointed out above, such information is an essential part of the student personnel records of an institution. Eastern Michigan College and other institutions with incomplete employment records should extend their student personnel service records to include facts of employment regarding students. Such a record, containing an evaluation of the student's work by his immediate supervisor, will prove of considerable value to the student in his search for his first full-time job upon graduation, and should greatly assist the effort to make the employment of students a meaningful experience. In the case of the University of Michigan, which reported the number of students employed but not the total amount paid out, members of the personnel staff indicated that this information will hereafter be collected in the offices of student personnel deans.

In collecting the basic data on employment of students in the Michigan institutions an attempt was made also to obtain information about the extent to which wives (or husbands) of students are employed in positions on the campus. For a married couple, one of whom is a student, the employment earnings of the wife (or husband) is very frequently a means of financing the educational program. The response to the request for data indicated that very few institutions have records on the employment of wives (or husbands) of students. Only three of the State-controlled institutions could furnish such information -- Central Michigan College, Michigan College of Mining and Technology, and Michigan State University.

At Michigan State University there is a total of over 900 employees in this category, with annual earnings in excess of $2,700,000. This is obviously a very substantial amount of assistance in financing the educational programs of graduate students.

In conclusion, it should be noted that the analysis of institutionally administered employment was complicated somewhat by the inadequate records at many of the institutions. In some instances this is due to lack of centralized records, while in others it is due to lack of records entirely. But, whether records are kept or not, the general concensus of institutional administrators supports the use of student labor on the campus, from three points of view: (1) having a readily available labor force; (2) providing meaningful experiences for students; and, (3) furnishing students an opportunity to earn funds to assist them in financing their college education.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study has been concerned with the formally organized programs of scholarships and fellowships, student loans, and employment in Michigan colleges and universities, designed to assist students financially to undertake and complete their college and university education. The basic purpose of such aid programs is to encourage the capable student, lacking personal finances, to pursue a course of study in an institution of higher education.

The continuing efforts to aid students result in part from the steadily increasing cost of a college education, a cost which, to some extent, has been passed on to the student. An idea of these costs may be obtained from a consideration of the average cost, per year, of attending one of the three types of institutions in the State of Michigan, as derived from institutional catalogs of 1956-57. Taking into account only tuition, fees, and board and room, the average cost at the State-controlled institutions for a Michigan resident in 1956-57 was \$700 to \$900 per year. For a non-resident of Michigan the average cost was \$160 greater. The average cost for a "resident student" in a community college was \$144 and to a "non-resident" it was \$215. The last two figures do not include room and board. In the privately controlled institutions the average tuition and fee charges were \$365 per year, varying from a low of \$90 to a high of \$550. Adding to these figures the cost of room and board, the average cost of tuition, fees, and room and board for the privately controlled institutions varies from a low of approximately \$590 to a high of \$1,250. It must be remembered that these averages do not include such expenses as books, cost of laundry, travel, and other incidental but necessary costs of attending a college or university.

A second reason for the existence of these programs of financial assistance to students is the awareness on the part of the institutions of higher education that it is important for them to attract and retain promising young scholars on their campuses. A strong incentive is financial support available in one form or another. As a result, all types of institutions, private and public, have been trying to obtain larger sums of money than they have had in the past, to be used for scholarships, fellowships, and other forms of financial assistance to students.

It has been the purpose of this study to collect, summarize, and analyze data regarding programs of financial assistance to students in the colleges and universities in Michigan. Such an analysis should prove particularly helpful to the individual institutions in the evaluation of their own programs, to potential donors, to members of the Legislature who have the responsibility for making appropriations to the State-controlled institutions, and, finally, to students and prospective students and their parents.

This study is concerned with three general types of financial assistance available to students: (1) scholarships and fellowships, (2) loans, and (3) employment by the institution. It should be pointed out that consideration in this study has been given only to programs of student aid that are administered through the institutions. There are many non-institutional agencies, such as service clubs, labor organizations, industrial and business corporations, church groups, fraternal orders, endowed foundations, and even the Federal Government, that have programs of financial assistance for college students. These non-institutional programs of student aid have not been identified or included in the data of this study.

Responses to the request for data for this study were received from 55 institutions of higher education in the State of Michigan. These institutions represent 97 per cent of the students enrolled in higher education in the State during 1956-57.

It is significant to note the amounts of money actually utilized during the year in various financial aid programs. The data are recapitulated in Table 40. For all the institutions reporting, a total of $8,445,779 was involved. Of this amount, $3,154,983 was awarded in scholarships and fellowships; $3,901,990 was earned through employment within the institutions; and $1,408,806 was utilized in the form of loans. This gross total represents approximately $80 of financial assistance per full-time-equivalent student enrolled in these institutions of higher education in Michigan. Because of incomplete reports from several institutions, the actual totals are, undoubtedly, substantially larger than indicated here.

As large as this amount of financial aid funds may appear, it is evident that, on the basis of data on increased costs of college attendance and research evidence identifying financial inadequacy as a prime factor in keeping academically promising students from attending college, the State and the individual institutions should continue to study ways and means of providing even greater financial assistance for the student with college potential and financial need. Although Michigan stood relatively high among the States in 1955-56 in the provision of financial assistance to students, according to the study by the U. S. Office of Education,[1] it must be recognized that this higher than average utilization of loan funds and participation in campus employment may reflect a greater need among Michigan college students and their earnest zeal to meet this need by taking on-campus jobs. And, since institutions in all other States are attempting to increase the volume of their student aid programs, similar increases must be made in Michigan if the institutions in this State are to continue to provide relatively adequate service to their students.

---

[1] Theresa Birch Wilkins, Financial Aid for College Students: Undergraduate. U. S. Office of Education, Bulletin 1957, No. 18, p. 2.

Table 40. Totals of Financial Assistance to Students in Various Forms at Each of the Three Kinds of Institutions in Michigan during 1956-57.

Form of Financial Assistance	State-controlled Institutions		Privately Controlled Institutions		Community Colleges		Totals, All Institutions Combined	
	Number of Students Served	Amount	Number of Students Served	Amount	Number of Students Served	Amount	Number of Students Served	Amount
Scholarships and fellowships awarded	11,509	$2,692,347	1,849	$ 419,309	398	$43,327	13,756	$3,154,983
Loans made to students	11,600	1,323,931	721	78,173	349	6,702	12,670	1,408,806
Employment of students	16,189	3,311,038	2,482	545,289	328	45,663	18,999	3,901,990
Totals for all forms of financial assistance	39,298	$7,327,316	5,052	$1,042,771	1,075	$95,692	45,425	$8,445,779

In the consideration of funds available for scholarships and fellowships, it was shown that funds not derived from governmental agencies are the source of a major portion of scholarship funds. The private donors of this State are to be commended heartily for their generous philanthropy. Private gifts may be expected to be a major source of student aid funds in the privately controlled institutions, but in the over-all picture for the State-controlled institutions and community colleges private gifts were also the major source of student aid funds. On the basis of amounts of money available for scholarships in the three types of institutions, it is evident that all of them face an increasing problem of acquiring additional funds for these purposes. The problem in the privately controlled institutions, with their relatively higher tuitions, is a critical one. It deserves the attention and sympathetic consideration of all who are in a position to assist in providing such funds. At the same time, all the institutions should be implementing plans for the cultivation of prospective donors in the ranks of their alumni, church constituencies, business, and industry.

The ratio of the number of freshmen to the number of other undergraduates receiving scholarships is about 1 to 3 in the State-controlled institutions, and about 1 to 1.5 in the privately controlled colleges and universities. One of the problems evident in some of the private institutions is the fact that relatively low class-enrollments at the upper division level place an unusually heavy burden on their instructional budgets. These institutions might well give attention to the possibility that, by providing additional scholarships at these upper levels, they might increase their retention of students and thus raise the average class enrollments. Most of these institutions could increase the enrollments in their upper division classes without corresponding increases in the number of faculty members.

The average amount of scholarship awards per recipient in the privately controlled institutions is greater than the corresponding average at the State-controlled institutions or the community colleges. The difference is by no means large enough, however, to counterbalance the relatively higher tuition fees in the privately controlled institutions. This, again, emphasizes the urgency of the problem which the privately controlled institutions face with regard to acquiring additional funds for financial aid to students.

Several of the State-controlled and privately controlled institutions should give study to the diversification of the sizes of their scholarship grants. An institution, all of whose scholarship awards are of the same value, or nearly so, is not exercising imagination in its scholarship programming, and is not giving due attention to differentials of financial need and student abilities in making scholarship awards.

Scholarship and fellowship awards to graduate students are considerably larger, on the average, than similar awards made to undergraduates. Such a difference in amounts is wholly justified, and in some instances the difference could well be increased by making larger stipends available for graduate students.

An analysis of the bases for making scholarship awards indicates that, in general, careful attention is given to academic ability and financial need, and such other qualifications as may be designated by the donors of scholarship funds. A limited number of funds are still being awarded, generally on the basis of the donors' stipulations, without any particular attention being paid either to financial need or academic potential. It is the recommendation of this study that all institutions in which scholarship funds -- designated as scholarships -- do not carry with them some requirement of demonstrated academic ability, make every reasonable attempt to modify the listed qualifications. Specifically, the designation "scholarship" should be reserved for awards which have some requirement or expectation of academic excellence.

The data of this study indicate that a relatively small percentage of scholarship awards are made for certain special abilities of applicants, as in music, debate, etc. A somewhat larger percentage of specific designations is found in relation to the academic objectives of the applicant -- teacher education, engineering, etc. Such specific designations of scholarship funds, say for prospective teachers and engineers, are not wholly undesirable. This sort of specific limitation of awards, however, should be kept to a reasonable minimum. It would appear wiser for donors to leave the distribution of awards to the responsible institutional officials, rather than to tie up the funds permanently for students in a given academic field of study or with some highly specialized ability.

Inquiry was made as to the amounts of scholarship funds which may be unavailable to applicants because of peculiar or overly-stringent requirements, set forth by the donor, that make difficult the finding of a suitable recipient. The amount of such scholarships in Michigan is small. Institutions in which such funds are vested, however, should make every effort to free them from these unduly restrictive clauses.

As was pointed out previously, the term "scholarship" is applied to certain awards which require service or repayment. It is the recommendation of this study that the term "scholarship" or "fellowship" be reserved for designation of only those awards for which no service or repayment is required.

The analysis of institutional loan funds indicated that during the 1956-57 academic year a fairly large percentage of loan funds were not used in several of the institutions, although current economic trends appear to have changed the situation during the 1957-58 year. The privately controlled colleges and universities made relatively little use of their student loan funds in 1956-57. It is probable, for this reason, that these institutions have not continued very intensive efforts to secure additional funds in this category. Their greatest need, as was pointed out above, is in the area of scholarship funds.

The data of this study indicate an extensive use of short-term loan funds, particularly in the publicly controlled institutions. One university, for example, loaned during the year twice the amount of money available in the capital of its loan fund. The short-term loan serves a unique purpose for those students utilizing it. At the same time, colleges and universities will have to make increasing amounts available in the form of long-term loans, especially in light of current economic trends.

On the basis of the reports in this study, one can conclude that the loan funds of the various institutions have been very well managed, with extremely small losses due to bad debts. For this reason, and the evident economy of administration, it is the recommendation of this study that responsibility for the administration of any State-wide provision, if any, of additional loan funds for students in higher education be lodged directly in the individual institutions.

Several of the institutions, in response to the request for data on student employment, reported relatively poor records or no records at all of the employment experiences of their students. Because of the personal and professional values derivable from well-planned and supervised employment, it is the recommendation of this study that student personnel records in all institutions include complete information regarding the employment experiences of students during their years in college.

Currently, various factors have contributed to a rather widespread interest, on the national and State scene, in the consideration of plans for providing scholarship funds through Federal and/or State appropriations. Fundamentally, these proposals are based on the conclusion that the major reason why many very capable high-school graduates do not go on to college is inability to meet the expenses of higher education. There is convincing evidence to support this conclusion.

In the opinion of the writer, a scholarship program supported by State appropriations is not a feasible solution at present in Michigan to the problem of inducing a larger number of the most capable high-school graduates to enter college. Several considerations lead to this conclusion.

1. Scholarship provisions at present available in Michigan are large and compare favorably with those available in other States, considering the size of the student enrollments to be served.[1] State appropriations much larger than the amounts that have been proposed would be necessary if any substantial improvement is to be made in the scholarship provisions available to Michigan young people.

2. The State Legislature is already finding it difficult to provide appropriations for the current support and capital outlay needed in the State-controlled institutions of higher education to serve their present enrollments. It would be unfortunate to subtract funds from appropriations needed for current support and capital outlay in order to provide scholarships for still more students who attend the institutions. The pressures of increasing enrollments, without any further scholarship aid, will undoubtedly tax the resources of the State for the support of the publicly controlled universities, colleges, and community colleges during the next five or ten years.

---

[1] Theresa Birch Wilkins, Financial Aid for College Students: Undergraduate. U. S. Office of Education, Bulletin 1957, No. 18, p. 2.

3. There are evident complications in administering a State-wide scholarship program supported by public funds, in which the objective would be to induce additional numbers of the most capable high-school graduates to atttend college. There could be no assurance, for example, that the institutions would not merely use the new source of scholarship aid to replace some or all of the aid now given from their general unrestricted funds, thus resulting in no increase in the total aid given or the number of students aided after the additional State support is provided.

4. The inauguration of a system of scholarships supported by State appropriations might well discourage future gifts and grants for scholarship purposes from private sources. The institutions in Michigan have received rather generous gifts from philanthropically inclined persons for scholarship purposes. To diminish the incentive for such gifts would be most unfortunate.

5. The Congress of the United States currently has before it a well-supported proposal for a system of Federal grants for scholarships for college students. The State should not take action setting up any scholarship program supported by appropriations of State tax money until a decision is reached about the provision of Federally supported scholarships. A scholarship program seems much more justifiable as an object of support by Federal funds than as an object of support by State funds. Students to whom scholarships are awarded should be free to cross State lines and to attend an institution anywhere in the country that can best serve their needs. Students who complete their education with scholarship aid should be free to go to whatever part of the country is most in need of their services. This desirable inter-state migration of students and graduates tends to be inhibited by State scholarship systems, but is entirely feasible under a system of Federal scholarship grants.

It is the conclusion of the writer that the State of Michigan can best serve its young people by leaving the matter of scholarship provisions in the hands of the individual institutions and the Federal Government, and by seeking, as a State, to provide the means for adequate support of higher education so that institutions may maintain the lowest possible level of charges for tuition and fees. Such a policy will probably do more than a State-supported scholarship system to encourage capable young people to attend college. Essentially this position was taken in the recent resolution adopted by the 1958 Annual Conference on Higher Education, held in Chicago, which said in part:

> "Because of the great need of the country for the cultivation of the potentialities of its young people for all socially useful areas of service, and because of the financial barriers that at present prevent large numbers of young people from pursuing an education beyond the high school, we urge:
>
> (a) State and local governments to make maximum efforts, through public funds, to provide and maintain diversified facilities for higher education of good quality at the lowest possible cost to students.
>
> (b) Institutions of higher education to continue to encourage substantial gifts from private donors, corporations, and other non-governmental agencies for scholarships and fellowships to highly qualified students and also for student loan funds in such institutions as do not at present have adequate capital funds for loan purposes."

It was pointed out in a previous chapter that the average scholarship and fellowship grants made in Michigan institutions compare well with the national averages. In spite of this, it is quite evident that the scholarship funds are, perhaps, not at the level they ought to be. Industry and business, labor organizations, philanthropic foundations, private donors, and other interested persons should be strongly encouraged to continue and increase their support of scholarship programs in the Michigan institutions of higher education.

Although a State system of scholarships supported by legislative appropriations is not recommended, recognition should be given to the fact that, without specific authority, the State-controlled institutions have been using for scholarship purposes funds of a general, unrestricted sort provided to them by the State. These scholarships are reported in this study as having been made from general, unrestricted institutional funds. While this category of funds includes money derived from various sources, probably from two-thirds to three-fourths of the total fund comes from State appropriations. The four institutions under the State Board of Education have a tacit agreement for a State-supported system of scholarships, in the form of the remission, for a given number of students, of that part of the tuition fee which otherwise would be collected and turned over to the State's general fund.

The present arrangement for the use of public funds for scholarship purposes in Michigan is a rather haphazard one. The Legislature is without information, in making its annual appropriations, about the exact extent to which the money it is appropriating will be used for scholarship purposes. The data of this study indicate that the provision of scholarships from the general, unrestricted funds of the State-controlled institutions is by no means equal in the various institutions.

It would seem wise for the Legislature to regularize the use of general, unrestricted institutional funds, especially that part of such funds which may be derived from unrestricted appropriations. The Legislature could also develop a plan of equalizing the amount that may be used from this source for scholarship purposes in the various institutions. Such a plan should not result in diminishing the amounts so applied at present in any institution, but over a period of years a distribution of support for such scholarship programs could be developed that would be equitable among the institutions.

It is recognized that the Legislature, according to present interpretations of the State Constitution, cannot control the expenditure of any funds at two of the State universities, but there is nothing to prevent the Legislature from announcing a policy on the matter that it would like to have the institutions follow. The Legislature could, furthermore, take into account the amount it deems equitable for scholarships in determining the appropriation for each institution, even though the amount would not be specifically ear-marked or set up as a line item. A simple method of announcing a policy on the matter would be in the form of permitting the use of amounts for scholarship purposes that would provide free tuition for a given percentage of the full-time-equivalent students enrolled in the institution the preceding year.

Some comments should be made on the State Board of Education scholarships now available through four of the institutions. First, with the rapid increase in enrollments at these institutions, it may be time for the State Board of Education to re-evaluate the maximum numerical limit set on these scholarships, with the possibility in mind of increasing the number from the 2,000 in effect at any one time to some higher figure.

Second, because enrollments at these institutions have not increased at equal rates, it would seem desirable to redistribute these scholarships among the institutions on a much more recent base than that now used.

Third, as worthy as scholarship provisions for foreign students may be, it is doubtful that any provision at all for foreign students, whether used by the institutions or not, should be made in these types of scholarships. Such provision does not seem to be a proper object for funds from a State government.

Fourth, in view of the fact that the basic problem is the provision of adequate financial assistance for Michigan residents as well as the attraction of highly qualified teacher-education candidates into the State, use of these scholarships should be permitted for out-of-state students, the exercise of this option being left with each institution.

Fifth, the amount of the scholarship grant should not be keyed as closely as it is at present to the amount of the State Treasury's portion of the tuition fee. This amount is relatively small and in many cases the student should have a larger grant to enable him to attend college. The present practice encourages the institutions to make all the grants of an equal size, and thus tends to discourage and defeat the desirable administrative arrangement of differentiating the amount of scholarship grants according to the needs of the individual recipients.

In view of the fact that a State-wide study, such as this, of financial assistance to students -- conducted for the first time in the State of Michigan -- appears to have significant values for individual institutions, donors, members of the Legislature, and prospective students and their parents, it is recommended that a survey of financial assistance programs be conducted at least every five years in Michigan, the results of such analyses being made available to the institutions and interested individuals.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE FORM USED IN COLLECTING DATA ON FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO STUDENTS

MICHIGAN LEGISLATIVE STUDY COMMITTEE ON HIGHER EDUCATION
P. O. Box 240, State Capitol, Lansing, Michigan

Form III-D-6. Financial Assistance to Students.

Instructions:

The purpose of this study is to assemble information on the various student-aid funds available in the universities and colleges in Michigan, and the ways in which the funds are used and administered.

The study is concerned with three major kinds of student aid. The first consists of the sorts of grants to students that do not require any return of the amount by the recipient. These are variously known as scholarships, fellowships, grants-in-aid, or tuition discounts. These will be referred to in this report as scholarships. The second category of student aid consists of grants which the recipient is expected to return in cash, usually also with interest. These are usually known as student loan funds. The third category is remunerative employment furnished by the institution to its students. It is recognized that the three categories cannot always be sharply distinguished. For example, some fellowships and scholarships require students to give a certain amount of service in return for the grant; in accordance with U. S. Bureau of Revenue decisions, scholarships requiring some service to the institution, teaching fellowships, and departmental assistantships, should be classified in the third category as student employment.

This report should include only the funds actually administered by the institution. Grants made by persons or agencies outside the institution for the benefit of particular students designated by the donor should not be reported, even though the institution may actually handle the funds involved in such grants.

The information requested relates to the academic year 1956-57, September through June.

MICHIGAN LEGISLATIVE STUDY COMMITTEE ON HIGHER EDUCATION
P. O. Box 240, State Capitol, Lansing, Michigan

Form III-D-6. Financial Assistance to Students.

Name of Institution______________________________ Date______________

Name and Title of Person Reporting____________________________________

I. Scholarships (defined as grants administered by the institution requiring no return or service by the recipient)

1. Amount and source of funds available for scholarships in regular academic year, 1956-57:

   a. From general institutional funds, not specifically designated for scholarships by the source from which the fund was received. $__________

   b. From funds restricted to scholarship purposes:

      (1) Endowment income restricted to scholarships $__________

      (2) Private gifts and grants restricted to scholarships $__________

      (3) State Government* $__________

      (4) Other restricted sources (please list)

      ____________________________________ $__________

      ____________________________________ $__________

*This item refers specifically to scholarships in the State institutions that are provided through budgetary arrangements with the State Legislature, the funds not being available for any other institutional purpose.

2. Total award of scholarships made during regular academic year 1956-57, classified according to the level of the recipient:

	Number of Recipients	Total Amount of Awards
a. Entering freshmen	________	$________
b. Undergraduates other than entering freshmen	________	$________
c. Graduate students	________	$________

3. Indicate the number of awards made in 1956-57 under each of the following conditions:

	From General Institutional Funds	From Restricted to Scholarship Purposes
a. Without regard to the financial needs of the recipient.	________	________
b. In an amount determined by the financial needs of the recipient.	________	________
c. Only to those having financial need, but amount of the grant not determined by degree of recipient's need.	________	________

4. Please indicate the number of grants that were:

	From General Institutional Funds	From Funds Restricted to Scholarship Purposes
a. Just equal to the institution's tuition fee	______	______
b. Half the amount of the institution's tuition fee	______	______
c. Some other specified fraction of the tuition fee	______	______
d. Less than the tuition fee, but no specified fraction	______	______
e. Greater than the institution's tuition fee	______	______

5. Number of students receiving scholarship grants of each size:

a. More than $2,500______

b. $1,500 to $2,500______

c. $1,000 to $1,499______

d. $ 800 to $ 999______

e. $ 600 to $ 799______

f. $ 500 to $ 599______

g. $400 to $499______

h. $300 to $399______

i. $200 to $299______

j. $100 to $199______

k. $ 50 to $ 99______

l. Less than $50______

6. Number of awards and total amount of awards, classified according to restrictions on the qualifications of the recipients. (report awards under each classification, regardless of duplication)

	Number of Awards	Amount of Awards
a. Restrictions related to levels of students:		
(1) Freshmen only	______	$______
(2) Undergraduates only	______	$______
(3) Undergraduates other than freshmen	______	$______
(4) Graduate students only	______	$______
(5) Upper division and graduate students	______	$______
(6) Entering students, regardless of level	______	$______
(7) No restrictions on the level of the recipient	______	$______
(8) Indicate any other restrictions with respect to level of students		
______	______	$______
______	______	$______

(question continued on next page)

Page 3

Form III-D-6

6. (continued)	Number of Awards	Amount of Awards
b. Restrictions related to prior academic achievement and financial need:		
(1) No restrictions regarding recipient's financial need or academic achievement (other than a record qualifying for entrance or continuance in school)	________	$________
(2) Restricted to those who have demonstrated a high level of academic achievement, but without regard to financial need	________	$________
(3) Restricted to those who have financial need, without regard to academic qualifications (other than a record qualifying for entrance or continuance)	________	$________
(4) Restricted to those who have both a high academic record and financial need	________	$________
c. Restrictions related to the sex of the recipient:		
(1) No restriction as to sex of recipient	________	$________
(2) Restricted to men students only	________	$________
(3) Restricted to women students only	________	$________
d. Restrictions related to the residence of the recipient:		
(1) No restrictions on residence of the recipient	________	$________
(2) Restricted to foreign students	________	$________
(3) Restricted to non-residents of Michigan	________	$________
(4) Restricted to residents of Michigan	________	$________
(5) Restricted to residents of particular places or areas in Michigan	________	$________
(6) Restricted to residents of particular places or areas outside of Michigan	________	$________
e. Time limitations on holding of the scholarship:		
(1) May be held for one year only	________	$________
(2) May be renewed for one or more additional years provided recipient meets stated qualifications	________	$________

(question continued on next page)

6. (continued)	Number of Awards	Amount of Awards
f. Restrictions related to the objective of the recipient's preparation:		
(1) No restriction on the objective of the recipient's preparation	________	$________
(2) Restricted to liberal arts students only	________	$________
(3) Restricted to those preparing for agriculture	________	$________
(4) Restricted to those preparing for engineering	________	$________
(5) Restricted to those preparing for home economics	________	$________
(6) Restricted to those preparing for law	________	$________
(7) Restricted to those preparing for librarianship	________	$________
(8) Restricted to those preparing for medicine	________	$________
(9) Restricted to those preparing for nursing	________	$________
(10) Restricted to those preparing for pharmacy	________	$________
(11) Restricted to those preparing for social work	________	$________
(12) Restricted to those preparing for teaching	________	$________
(13) Restricted to those preparing for theology	________	$________
(14) List any other similar restrictions:		
________________________________	________	$________
________________________________	________	$________
g. Restrictions related to special non-academic abilities or qualifications of the recipient:		
(1) No restrictions as to special abilities	________	$________
(2) Restricted to those having:		
(a) Ability in art	________	$________
(b) Athletic ability	________	$________
(c) Debating ability	________	$________
(d) Journalistic ability	________	$________
(e) Leadership in extra-curriculum activities	________	$________
(f) Musical ability	________	$________
List any others: ________________	________	$________
________________	________	$________

7. Are recipients expected to repay scholarships when they leave this institution:

   a. If they transfer to some other institution before graduation:___yes___no

   b. After they graduate from this institution:_____yes _____no

8. Please indicate the number of possible grants and the amount of funds involved in scholarships that are difficult to award because of very special or restrictive qualifications or requirements regarding the recipients:

   Number of such scholarships_____________ amount of funds involved________

II. Student loan funds.

9. Statement of loan fund capital during 1956-57:

   a. Total assets of loan funds at beginning of fiscal year $________

   b. Additions to capital of loan funds during the year:

      (1) From gifts and contributions $________

      (2) From earnings of the funds

         (a) from interest on student loans $________

         (b) from earnings of other investments of the funds $________

      (3) Other additions $________

   c. Uncollectible loans written off during the year $________

   d. Other subtractions from loan fund capital $________

   e. Total assets of loan funds at end of fiscal year $________

10. Condition of assets of loan funds at end of fiscal year 1956-57:

    a. Amount in student notes $________

    b. Amount in cash and liquid investments $________

    c. Amount in non-liquid investments $________

11. Loans made and interest collected during the year 1956-57:

    a. Number of loans made during the year________; Total amount loaned $______

    b. Total collections of principal of loans during the year $________

    c. Total interest collected on student loans during the year $________

    d. Amount of interest collections during the year $____________

12. Total amount of student loan notes more than two years overdue $________

Form III-D-6

13. Length of term of student loans. Indicate number and amount of loans for each length of term made during 1956-57:

	Number of Loans	Amount of Loans
a. Expected to be repaid in full within year in which made	______	$______
b. Expected to be repaid in full within six months after end of year in which made	______	$______
c. Expected that repayments will extend more than six months after end of year in which loan was made	______	$______

III. Remunerative employment.

14. Indicate the number of students employed and total amount of compensation paid in regular academic year 1956-57 in each of the following categories:

	Number of Students	Amount of Compensation
a. Undergraduates receiving awards that required some service to the institution, even though such awards are designated as "scholarships".	______	$______
b. Graduate students receiving awards that required some service to the institution, even though such awards are designated as "scholarships", "fellowships","departmental assistantships".	______	$______
c. Other students given employment by the institution	______	$______

15. If institutional records are available, indicate the number of students, and the amount of earnings, of students' wives (or husbands) employed by the institution in 1956-57:

a. Number of students having wife (or husband) employed by institution______

b. Total earnings of students' wives (or husbands) $______

IV. Administration of financial assistance to students.

Please append a statement describing briefly the administrative procedure used in making awards of financial assistance to students. Indicate the institutional officials who are responsible for making awards of each kind, and the degree of centralization or decentralization in the administration of the program of financial assistance. Any special features of the institution's program of financial assistance to students should be described.

APPENDIX B

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION SCHOLARSHIPS

The Michigan State Board of Education Scholarships, available through the four institutions -- Western Michigan University, Central Michigan College, Eastern Michigan College, and Northern Michigan College -- can, at best, be traced to some informal arrangements in the early days of the state normal schools and teachers colleges. It is a fact that during the days of these institutions, there were established 400 annual scholarships at these institutions for those students agreeing to teach in the rural schools of the State.

With the increase, in 1948, of tuition rates at the teachers colleges to $75 per year, the State Board of Education, after discussions with the Legislative Ways and Means Committee and the State Budget Officers, increased the number of annual scholarships from 400 to 1,000. Since each scholarship could be renewed for an additional year, this meant 2,000 of them in effect at any one time. In practice, the scholarships are actually renewable for four years, but the number in effect at any one time is kept at or below 2,000.

It should be pointed out that these scholarships at the four institutions provide only the amount of tuition that is normally returned to the State Treasury. The tuition charge at each of the four institutions is set up in two parts. One part is a local fee, which is retained by the institution for its own use. The other is a State fee, which in the past has been remitted to the State Treasury to become a part of the State's general funds. In the arrangement for the award of the scholarships at the four institutions, the State has merely agreed to forego its share of the income from the tuition fees of those students to whom the awards are made. So far as can be determined, on the basis of inquiries to the staff of the State Board of Education, members of the staff of the State Department of Public

Instruction, officials of the institutions concerned, and the budget office of the State Department of Administration, there is no specific legal basis for this arrangement, but it is merely a part of the informal agreement made with the finance committees of the Legislature at the time the appropriation bills are developed and passed. Over the period of years the arrangement seems to have become traditional and accepted as a part of the pattern of student aid.

Originally, the awarding of these scholarships was processed through a secretary on the staff of the State Board of Education. When this task became greater than could be handled in this manner, the processing of the applications was turned over to the individual institutions. Also, on May 10, 1950, the State Board of Education established the current, numerical distribution of these scholarships to the various institutions. This distribution is based on the average number of students prepared at each institution who were certified to teach in Michigan during the five-year period preceding 1950. On this basis, the number of scholarships available through each of the institutions is as follows: Western Michigan University --- 693; Eastern Michigan College --- 623; Central Michigan College --- 516; and, Northern Michigan College --- 163. It was also at this time that each institution was authorized to grant 20 such scholarships to foreign students.

The State Board of Education further stipulated that special preference was to be given to those applicants entering elementary teaching as long as elementary teachers were needed in greater numbers than secondary school teachers, and that the scholarships were to be awarded to Michigan residents only, except that a few could be used for out-of-state students who showed exceptionally high qualifications, after the general demand from Michigan residents had been met.